

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_74517
Title of the Manuscript:	Phaeohyphomycosis caused by Cochliobolus hawaiiensis in a Camel Farm in Saudi Arabia: An Emerging Disease
Type of the 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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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	It is a very interesting paper but need some corrections to better understanding the case. Along the text there are Latin names, the species of fungi, that are not in italic is important to corrected them, even in the references. Some parts of the text have different formation. It is necessary a review of the English, is not bad but there are small grammatical mistakes along the text. In the results section the section of ITS Gene Sequence needs to be improved as it is doesn't mean nothing, and the results obtained are not clear. In the discussion section would be interesting to know how the animals were treated. Competing interested are marked at yellow, some reason why?	Corrected
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Along the text change "ml" to "mL" The abstract is a little long, could be a little shorter and concise. Latim names should be in italic – this happens all around the text Methods: text with different formation and a section of text that is out of place. Some grammar mistakes Results should beat bolt Fig4: latim names in italic ITS Gene Sequence: is not enough what is presented you have to explain the process and what was obtain, how is presented now does not means nothing References with different formations	I have corrected all the correction that you have mention.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	