



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRID_50290
Title of the Manuscript:	NEWLY EMERGING CANDIDA SPECIE: SHOULD CLINICIANS AND MYCOLOGIST BE CONCERNED?
Type of the Article	Minireview 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>The manuscript is well presented and adequately researched. Its faults are mainly in the areas of mechanics of manuscript preparation and a couple of confusing statements that should readily be fixed.</p> <p>When using genus and species names, both should be italicized and the italic should be consistent. Many times the authors did not use the italic font correctly.</p> <p>The authors have created some potential confusion by describing <i>C. aurus</i> as having fewer virulence factors but being more virulent. They should look carefully at the consistency of each instance of this concept and be sure not to conflate the number of virulence factors with virulence. Expression of virulence factors may occur differentially under host conditions and moth larva, human, mouse or in vitro may represent environments sufficiently different to account for seeming contradiction. Note text at line 9 and at 32 and following</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>These items need to be fixed, but are of a lesser significance than section above</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Line 27 the reference for "recently identified" is 10 years ago. 2. Line 91 'grows' should be grow 3. Line 107 should be 'isolates'? 4. Line 112 clarify percent of what? 5. Line 133 the use of 'alarming' is a bit of hyperbole that is not needed in an objective report 6. Line 134 'hosts' 7. Line 152 and 153 'plastic healthcare surface' is awkward and not meaningful 8. Line 155 not a complete sentence and not supported. 9. Line 161 and following is awkward and a bit confusing and the method of establishing effectiveness is not clear (MIC vs environmental scan) 10. Line 187 'lower' than what? 11. Line 196 is osmotic pressure and temperature high in the host? 	
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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:	Bryan Larsen
Department, University & Country	College of Osteopathic Medicine, Marian University Indianapolis, USA