



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_36425
Title of the Manuscript:	Isolation and Molecular Characterization of Dermatophytes In Donkeys
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>)

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	In the present study, the authors wrote a respect of skin infection on 31 donkeys in Eldamazine State. <i>Trichophyton mentagrophytes</i> and <i>T. verrucosum</i> were the isolated fungi most found and the authors used β -tubulin gene, by PCR, to confirme the identification the fungi result. So it is possible use this molecular technics to determinate the dermatophytes.	I also recommend the use of β -tubulin for molecular technique to characterize different dermatophyte spp.
Minor REVISION comments	In line 44, ring worm is written separately. In line 99, 65 μ l 10% what is it? Thirty-one donkeys were studied so it would be interesting to present the statistical analysis of what was found in each item studied. Put the reference in numerical order.	Line... 44... ringworm was corrected. Line 99 ..65 μ l CTAB (Cetyltrimethyl-ammonium bromide), but this part should be removed because I did not used it in this study. So I added the word and and rearranged the sentence. Sorry for inconvenience. Regarding statistical analysis of the isolates, 31 samples were examined only 19samples revealed ecto and endothrix spores on direct examination and only six out of that are able to show +ve Dermatophyte colony. 3 were identified as <i>T. mentagrophytes</i> , 2 as <i>T.verrucosum</i> and 1 as <i>T. tonsurans</i> . We selected 2 colonies from <i>T. mentagrophytes</i> and 2 from <i>T.verrucosum</i> for further identification with PCR.
Optional/General comments		