



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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Topic should be rephrased to Comparative study of Vaginal candidiasis in pregnant and non-Pregnant women attending Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida Specialist Hospital and General Hospital, Minna Niger state. 2. Lines 29-60 should be discussed in view of vaginal candidiasis only. 3. Abstract do not have citations please remove 4. Your abstract should have sub headings like aim, study design, place and duration of study, materials and methods etc. Please see journal template for authors guidelines 5. Your introduction in lines 8 and 9 do not relate with the authors topic 6. Line 14 biochemical tests 7. The collection of a total of 40 samples only is too small to represent the entire population studied. Kindly increase population size. What is the population of Niger state? 8. The abstract does not state any results 9. What statistical tool was used for this comparative study 10. Why did you conduct gram staining for candida and why do you have suspected <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> bacteria colonies when you screened for candida? lines 101-115 11. Line 135 should be germ tube test and this test is a presumptive test not a confirmatory test. 12. Results are conflicting 40 and 80 as total sample screened 13. The discussion is poorly written. Compare each of your results with the findings of other authors. The citations in your discussion are too old for your current study 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sub topics and headings are not numbered 2. Remove lines 64-67 3. Discuss lines 70-71 in details i.e location, longitude, etc. 4. There is a contradiction in sample size 40 and 80 5. Lines 88- how were the samples preserved before reaching the laboratory? Did you conduct microscopy with the vaginal swab before inoculating on media? Who collected the samples from the women? At what temperature were the samples incubated? 6. Line 96 IDENTIFICTION should be IDENTIFICATION 7. Line 127 did you conduct a fermentation test? 8. Line 132 ...cover slip and mounted on a microscope. 9. Some scientific names are not italicized. Line 170 10. Please recast conclusion 11. Citations from lines 102 to 226 do not conform with journal guidelines. 12. Some references do not follow journal style especially punctuations. 13. Reference 13 not listed 14. 	



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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	L.Y. ADOGO
Department, University & Country	Bingam University Karu, Nigeria