



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| 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 |
| New title: | Comparative study of Vaginal Candidiasis in pregnant and non-Pregnant women attending Ibrahim Badamasi Babangida Specialist Hospital and General Hospital, Minna Niger state, Nigeria. |
| Type of Article: | Original Research Article |

PART 2:

| FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any) | Authors' response to final evaluator's comments |
|--|---|
| <p>The text is better, however it still needs revision. It seems that basic concepts of mycology / microbiology are not clear to the authors, such as the description in the results (lines 210 and following) and in table 4, when they report results of the presence of chlamyospores. The described methodology does not allow for the analysis of the presence of chlamyospores, which are formed, for example, in corn agar added tween 80 (see mycology books). Still in the methodology, the description of the gram technique, for example, does not add anything to the article, since it is a technique widely known in the field of microbiology and no modification was made to deserve it to be described. One reference simply is sufficient.</p> <p>The description in the part of Germinative Tube, when the authors cite "The spore and hyphae of the organism were visible, establishing a positive result for <i>Candida albicans</i> only" is inadequate. Kindness check what is germ tube next to the specialist mycologist of the team or check on the site: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK8099/figure/A3947/ , to properly describe what is observed and what is the germ tube.</p> <p>I would like to ask the authors to think about it: the article is about candidiasis ou women colonized by <i>Candida</i> species? In the methodology they describe "The study sample space consisted of eighty subjects without vaginal disorder". In fact the study was not done looking for colonized women and not those with infection? What is the difference between colonization and infection?</p> <p>The methodology described in the abstract session is repetitive.</p> <p>The results described in the abstract session could be better. I suggest the author read again, and do the correction that they thing, because an abstract is what readers when they are seeking out a study or paper.</p> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Name: | <i>Reginaldo dos Santos Pedroso</i> |
| Department, University & Country | <i>Franca University, Brazil</i> |