



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJBcRR_15254
Title of the Manuscript:	Fluorescent Detection of specific DNA sequences related to <i>Toxoplasma gondii</i> based on Magnetic Fluorescent Nanoparticles
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	This manuscript deals with the detection of certain DNA sequences based on magnetic fluorescence nanopartilces Fe₃O₄/ CdTe. The manuscript is clearly written, but the following clarifications/modifications are needed before it can be accepted for publication. In line 127, the authors stated that “the Fluorescence Intensity (FI) of CdTe QDs greatly enhanced with the time increasing”, and the question is that whether the authors used the same amount or concentration of QDs for their measurement otherwise, comparing the FI might be not relevant. If it is applicable, the author should provide more evidence to show that the final product have core/shell structure. Otherwise maybe the core/shell term could be replaced by a more suitable term.	1. Thank you for your remind. This is our negligence, the concentration of every sample is unified, and we have corrected the mistake in line 130. 2. It is our fault to describe the structure of Fe₃O₄/ CdTe nanoparticles with a wrong word. We have deleted the wrong words in the paper.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Some grammatical typo should be corrected for example: Line 89: were in “The Fe₃O₄ nanoparticles were gained after “ should be omitted Line 129: “was used all through experiments” should be replaced by “was used through all experiments” The scale in some figures should be improved because that could help reader to follow the paper more easily for example the scale used in fig 2b or font size in fig 4 is small, text in figure 7 is blurred.	3. Thank you for your comments. The grammatical mistakes in the paper have been corrected. 4. The scales of Fig. 2b and Fig. 4 have been improved, and it can help readers to follow the paper more easily.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		