



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_20425
Title of the Manuscript:	Vaginal microbiocinosis in women with infertility and parasite invasion
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	No	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>Material and methods 82 cases not 81 With age better to do mean and standard deviation Results Line 75: In 14% of examined women with primary 76 infertility ascarides eggs were found in feces, enterobiosis was detected in 13% of patients. Among 77 parasites in 41% of patients increased level of Ig G to ascarides was found, in 18% - to toxocara, in 78 6% - to lamblia (numbers should be written plus percentage)</p> <p>In table (1) why total number not 82 as total cases number</p>	<p>Thank You, I change.</p> <p>The difference in the figures in the table and the total number of patients is caused by the lack of results in all patients. Not all patients passed along stool examination for parasites and blood. Therefore, the total number of 82 patients studied, some patients did not result came through improper blood collection and questionable results. Worm eggs are not evaluated in all patients due to the refusal of some patients pass inspection in stool.</p>
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		