



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Microbiology</a>
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> 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"> <li>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.</li> <li>2. The objectives of the study are not well stated</li> <li>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</li> <li>4. Clearly state how subjects were recruited, stage of pregnancy, were there comparable-</li> <li>5. How were samples drawn? Describe, was consent taken? Any ethical approval obtained?</li> <li>6. Describe the lab preparation and isolation in narrative form and make reference if applicable to method ( conventional or if different).</li> <li>7. I think there are two components to this study-clinical and lab based- make this explicit.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>9. Were the new born studied- any intention</li> <li>10. Conclusions should have a take home message and if there are limitations</li> <li>11. Acknowledgment –any funding ?</li> </ol>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	-	
<b>Optional/General</b> 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<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>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b><i>Sivalingam Nalliah</i></b>
Department, University & Country	<b><i>Medical University, Malaysia</i></b>