



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_28858
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative analysis of molecular methods for detection of Influenza viruses
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	Please clarify the ethical issue if any.	No ethical issue is associated with this study because the whole study has been done on standard strains of influenza viruses and not on human samples. Therefore no ethical issue related to this study.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The study was designed to standardize the rapid molecular diagnostic assays and results were compared with virus isolation. The overall experimental methodology and procedures were valid except for a few minor expression shortcomings. Furthermore, there was not any comparison with the previous studies in the part "RESULTS AND DISCUSSION".	Some minor changes have been made in the 'results & discussion' part as per your suggestion.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The present study is conceptualized and aimed to detect influenza viruses by rapid molecular methods and compare with 'gold standard' virus isolation. The overall experimental methodology and procedures were valid, but the article needs a few minor modifications. The author should read and revise it carefully.	Some minor changes have been made have been made as suggested.