



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJTDH_17841
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigation of Melissa officinalis L. essential oil for antifungal activity against Cladosporium carrionii
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	lines 106, 121 – Why only the strains URM 5109 and CQ 03 were selected for these tests? Authors should explain this. Figure 1A, 2A – these figures do not show the values for <i>M. officinalis</i> 4X MIC Figure 1 and 2- these figures do not show the values for the samples after 14 days of incubation	- The MICs and MFCs were equal for all strains tested, thus to evaluate the effect of <i>Melissa officinalis</i> essential oil on the mycelial growth and conidial germination of <i>C. carrionii</i>, we selected two representative strains, <i>C. carrionii</i> CQ 03, belonging to the UFPB mycology collection, and <i>C. carrionii</i> URM 5109, belonging to the UFPE mycology collection. <i>Melissa officinalis</i> essential oil in concentrations of MIC x 2, and 4 x MIC was able to cause complete inhibition of microbial growth, mycelial growth was not observed in the presence of these concentrations during the 14 -day incubation period, thus the results at these concentrations are overlapped in Figures 1A and 2A . - The radial mycelial growth of <i>C. carrionii</i> strains was only observed for 14 days, which is the time for normal growth of the microorganism.
Minor REVISION comments	According to the Guidelines for Authors ABSTRACT section should be divided into sub-sections: Aims, Study design, Place and Duration of Study, Methodology, Results, Conclusion. lines 32, 35, 42, 84, 185, 237, 239, 264 is: “..<i>Melissa officinalis</i>..”, should be: “..<i>M. officinalis</i>..” line 34 is: “..[6,7,8,9]..”, should be: “..[6-9]..”	All suggestions were accepted and corrected in accordance with the request of the reviewer .



SDI Review Form 1.6

	lines 36, 65, 168, 202 is: “..Cladosporium carrionii..”, should be: “..C. carrionii..” lines 57, 76, 77 is: “..minutes..”, should be: “..min..” lines 90-91, 99 is: “..72 hours..”, should be: “..72 h..” line 102 is: “..[13,14,15]..”, should be: “..[13-15]..” line 116 is: “..[16,17,18]..”, should be: “..[16-18]..” lines 109, 110, 115, 123, 159, 169, 170, 171, 179, 180, 181, 186 is: “..2 X MIC...4 X MIC..”, should be: “..2×MIC...4×MIC..” line 192 is: “..at the CIM/2..”, should be: “..at the MIC/2..” line 191, 192, 211, 212 is: “..µg/mL..”, should be: “..µg/ml..” line 212 is: “..(Figure 3A)..”, should be: “..(Fig. 3A)..” line 213 is: “..(Figure 3B)..”, should be: “..(Fig. 3B)..” line 227 is: “..Meftahizade et al. (2010)..”, should be: “..Meftahizade et al. [22]..” line 230 is: “..Mimica-Dukin et al., (2004)..”, should be: “..Mimica-Dukic et al. [6]..” line 233 is: “..proposed by [23]..”, should be: “..proposed by Sartoratto et al. [23]..” line 294 is: “..Neurobehaviorak..”, should be: “..Neurobehavioral..” line 318 is: “..Eugenia caryophyllata..”, should be: “..Eugenia caryophyllata..” line 323 is: “..Aspergillus spp..”, should be: “..Aspergillus spp..”	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The title of the manuscript describes its content.	