



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2014_BMRJ_13082
Title of the Manuscript:	Unusual oropharyngeal asymptomatic manifestations caused by atypical pathogens detected by PCR into altered ecosystems of an infertile couple
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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. There are spelling mistakes, 2. The PCR method is not detailed out in MATERIALS AND METHODS part. 3, Include PCR results in results part. 4. Please simply results part.	1. The manuscript has been checked by a native English speaker for spelling, vocabulary, grammar and punctuation, and rephrasing. 2. According to general guidelines for authors, already published methods should be mentioned with references. That's what we made citing references #2 and #5. 3. We are not in agreement with Reviewer since we think molecular results have been adequately cited in "Results" section. 4. We think that "Results" section is adequate in length (compared to that of other Sections) and contents. Its simplification would affect reader' understanding of the work.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. Very good paper. 2. Included latest REFERENCES.	