



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>
Compulsory REVISION comments	Abstract Line 13: ulcered change to ulceration Line 17: ENT- write in full and then abbreviate. Line 18: Full stop and start a new sentence " The probability that mycoplasmosis..." Lines 12-17: Rewrite the sentences in shorter version to make it reader friendly. Line 18-27: Rewrite the paragraph to make it reader friendly. Introduction Line 35: "...on the glans..." Line 38: Place the word " figure 1B" at the end of the sentence. Line 41-42: rewrite the sentences. Line 45: "...the male one referred..."change to "partner Line "59: "PSA, VDRL and TPHA" state in full first. Line 63: "HPV" state the full name and then abbr. The same has to be performed for all other abbrv forms used in the methodology. Line 141: "3.3. Urogenital ecosystem" on a new section. Discussion Line 172: 'was' remove the word. Line 179: rewrite the sentence. Line 181: state what is one	Abstract Line 13: "ulcered" has replaced by "ulceration". Line 18: ENT has been explicated. We didn't understand this suggestion. According to Reviewer's suggestions, some sentences have been modified for better clarity (Lines 13, 14, 25). Introduction Line 36: "the" was added. Line 39: "figure 1B" has moved at the end of sentence. Lines 42-43: sentence has been reworted. Line 47: "one" was replaced by "partner". All abbreviations have been explicated at the first use throughout text (Lines 16, 21, 62, 63, 66, 67, 101, 102). Line 146: "Urogenital ecosystem" has been moved to a new section. Discussion Lines 177, 178 have been deleted because redundant. Lines 183-189: sentences were reworted for better clarity.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	There appears to be a single patient for this article. Therefore, it was difficult to comment statistically on the paper. Is this a review or a full manuscript?	In our work we clearly described a single case. We therefore submitted the manuscript as original research article, not as a review. It was not possible to perform statistical analysis since TMC values are generally referred to physiological values described in literature. Nevertheless, we used “higher” and “lower” terms with regard to differences in TMC, pH values, and nemasperms concentration values since values we observed were evidently “distant” from physiological values. That said, for greater accuracy, in the revised version of the manuscript we deleted term “significantly” throughout text (Lines 128, 171).