



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>This study requires some revision so as to be clear as to what the research question /questions are ? Some comments are made to this effect in the text.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction: As the focus in on pregnant women with candida infection, and may be affecting the new born-better to focus the literature review to these areas and not be generic in outlay. 2. The objectives of the study are not well stated 3. Methods and materials: what are the general and specific objectives, type of study, if this is comparative was the sample size calculated? Tests of significance would be applicable for drawing conclusions 4. Clearly state how subjects were recruited, stage of pregnancy, were there comparable- 5. How were samples drawn? Describe, was consent taken? Any ethical approval obtained? 6. Describe the lab preparation and isolation in narrative form and make reference if applicable to method (conventional or if different). 7. I think there are two components to this study-clinical and lab based- make this explicit. 8. Discussion should draw from the study- if this a problem that we need to study further-, were the subjects with positive isolates treated? If not would that be ethical. 9. Were the new born studied- any intention 10. Conclusions should have a take home message and if there are limitations 11. Acknowledgment –any funding ? 	<p>Corrections have been made in line with the reviewer comment.</p> <p>No ethical issues</p> <p>No funding in the course of the research</p> <p>New borns were not studied</p> <p>Conclusion reconstructed.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	-	
Optional/General comments	The results will have little implication in clinical practice as not mention is made as to inclusion and exclusion criteria.	

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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>There is no statement to this effect</p>	