



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2015_BMRJ_18012
Title of the Manuscript:	VIRULENCE OF FUSARIUM OXYSPOURUM ON KIDNEY ORGAN USING IN VIVO MICE MODEL
Type of the Article	Original Research Paper

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	23-43; Introduction should be brief, concise and the flow of thought from knowledge established in <i>Fusarium oxysporum</i> as a fungi pathogen associated with keratitis and evidence of universal virulence mechanisms shared by fungi with varied host ranges should be clear. -The argument for such an experiment should be clearly advanced in the following paragraph - The last paragraph in the introduction should clearly point out the aims of the experiment. 87-120; Under fungal isolation, referenced and well established need not be elaborated if there were no modifications made. Briefly state the test objective and the method employed with corresponding references. Section 2.2-2.5 should be merged into Fungal isolation and identification. 139-173; Established protocols which were not modified should be mentioned briefly as in 148-149 with corresponding references and this will suffice for histopathological studies. Since the study was focused on the effect of the <i>Fusarium</i> infection on mice kidney, a single plate showing its consequence on the skin will be enough and then a single plate clearly showing the composite photomicrographs of damaged kidneys compared to that of a normal kidney. 481; Conclusion should centre on set aims.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Abstract Place and Duration; carried out “at” Methodology; the lengthy list of plant isolate source could be deleted. Results; line 3-4 the sentence is not clear and your reference to infected lungs was not found in the study. Can this be clarified? Conclusion; line 2 “virulent” not “virulence” 307; “oxysporum” not “oxyspoprum” 456; “virulent” not “virulence” 485; this seems to be out of the scope of this study and should be deleted	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana