



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_49029
Title of the Manuscript:	USE OF MICA FUNGIN FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF A CLUSTER OF INVASIVE ASPERGILLOSIS IN CHILDREN WITH CANCER
Type of the 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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cure for cancer is 100% beneficial, how this would create an unmet need is not clear. Is invasive fungal infection really an unmet need? 2. Key words – should be written in italics, and outbreak should be excluded. <p>Introduction</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Too long, if it is reduced to 3 pages, it could flow better. 2. 'Clusters of IFI have been repeatedly reported also in pediatric patients' – please remove this statement because it has been repeated in the previous paragraph 3. The statement below needs a reference <p>Micafungin (50 mg) has been compared with itraconazole (5 mg/kg) for the prophylaxis of invasive fungal infections in HSCT recipients in a randomized, multicenter, open-label, non-inferiority trial.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The statement below is not clear – an alternative is preferred. <p>The rates of proven or probable (but not possible)</p> <p>Methodology</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. With respect to the statement below, does it imply that only cancer patients are treated in this children's hospital? <p><i>Patients and definition.</i> During a four-month time interval (December to April), all patients admitted in the ward received prophylaxis during the entire hospitalization if they had severe neutropenia (<500/mm³) regardless of the underlying disease.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. 27 children enrolled for the study, and all had prophylaxis for invasive aspergillosis. How then did you make a diagnosis of disease outbreak, when no one was infected? I don't think there was outbreak during the study period. 3. The study was on children, but the age range was 2 months – 21 years. 18 years and above are adults. Obviously the paediatric disposition of this study is in doubt. <p>Discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The characteristics of the patients admitted and treated during the study period were not different from those of the patients from those of the 14 patients. - Those of the patients is repeated, please delete one. 2. The 14 patients who had developed IA in the preceding months are not included in your methodology or results. It's not appropriate to include it in your discussion. 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>3. The pattern of the discussion suggests that the author could not find similar studies in literature. Yet there were no recommendations. What do you recommend?</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>1. The conclusion is not focused – it contains elements that should be in the discussion, such as the statements below:</p> <p>‘Our neutropenic patients, exposed to an obvious environmental risk, were allowed to carry on their therapeutic program without any reduction of the dose-intensity. The i.v. route of administration allowed reaching protective blood levels within a very short time, and the nurses considered the single daily dose convenient’</p> <p>Reference</p> <p>1. Reference number 14 was not sighted, please include it.</p>	
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?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Serious ethical issue. There was not approval for an interventional study of this nature</p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Ikobho Ebenezer Howells</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Niger Delta University Teaching Hospital , Nigeria</i>