



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_45762
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparative study of Candidiasis in pregnant and non-Pregnant women attending Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida Specialist Hospital and General Hospital, Minna Niger state
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	<p>The text has serious shortcomings, which I mention below.</p> <p>In the abstract, there is reference citation, it is unclear how many patients were included in the study (40 or 80?), Sabouraud is spelled wrong (line 12), the authors cite Candida infections when the correct would be Candida spp., No conclusion is made in the abstract instead the authors make comments on the methodology. The authors comment: "Biochemical analysis shows each <i>Candida</i> isolate's ability to utilize different sugars during Sugar Fermentation Test", which is not clear what they mean, since the sugar utilization test is done to identify the species and obviously one species is only identified if it has the ability to use one sugar differently from another.</p> <p>In the introduction, on line 33 "When it affects the vagina, it is commonly called a yeast infection", I would add vulvovaginitis. In the third paragraph the authors mix candidiasis of the mouth with vulvovaginitis so that it is not known if the article will mention vulvovaginal candidiasis or thrush in the mouth.</p> <p>Materials and methods: again it is unclear how many patients were included in the study, whether 40 or 80 in total. The methodology must be completely reformulated, in the form of a scientific article. Gram stains and cotton blue do not contribute anything to the identification of <i>Candida</i> species. In the Gram item, <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> is cited, which shows that the authors copied and pasted from another work without worrying about adaptations. In general, the part Materials and methods must be reformulated and rewritten. I recommend consulting articles from the area.</p> <p>Results: It is necessary to be clear in the text the difference between Candida isolation and candidiasis. Isolation in culture of candida species does not necessarily indicate infection. The authors cite chlamydospore (page 7, lines 163 et seq.). However, none of the techniques mentioned in the methodology makes it possible to detect chlamydospore. I recommend that the authors consult basic mycology and yeast identification books (results are shown in table 7). Join Tables 1 and 2. Join Tables 3 and 4. Join Tables 5 and 6.</p> <p>Discussion. No statistical treatment was done in the study. In line 208 the authors cite: "(...) be attributed to the higher hygiene awareness among users of the Specialist Hospital". The results shown in the study do not allow that speculation. There are cited references in the text that are not in the list of references. The discussion should be redone comparing results with those of the other local, regional, and global studies.</p> <p>Conclusion: it was not possible to understand the following sentence in the conclusion, according to context of the objectives/aims: "This suggests etiology, and also how these species of <i>Candida</i> ferment types of sugar, and the shapes when emulsified in mammalian serum, and under microscopic examination."</p>	<p>Corrections made according to reviewer's comment</p>
Minor REVISION comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

Optional/General comments		
----------------------------------	--	--

PART 2:

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