



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_51113
Title of the Manuscript:	Azole Resistance and Detection of the ERG11 gene in Clinical Candida albicans Isolated from Pregnant women with vulvovaginitis
Type of the Article	ORIGINAL

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>This research paper on resistance patterns to azoles in use of antifungal treatment of candidiasis in pregnant women is well written . The objectives is largely based on microbiology and molecular characteristics. The method employed for lab work is acceptable.</p> <p>Abstract and Introduction are well written and there are no grammatical mistakes. Methods: As a large part of the discussion is reflected on patient characteristics there will be greater validity in lining the microbiological findings if there is more clarification as to how the subjects were selected. The recruitment of pregnancy women appears to be using convenient sampling. This must be stated. As several epidemiological factors affect drug resistance pattern (as stated in the Discussion) there is a need to state if such factors were determined in the subjects selected. As patients who had been on treatment were included , some comment as to its effect on the final results should be discussed.</p> <p>Was sample size calculated to show a difference and any statistical tests used ? Were there cases of RECURRENT candidiasis- this is important to interpret the final results as to why resistance is noted. There is no mention of Candida spp. In microbiology . In literature review a comment on the impact of both recurrent candidiasis and Candida spp would be good.</p> <p>The microbiological assessment and lab based studies appear to be well conducted though an expert in such evaluation should also be asked to review this portion of the METHODS. Results: Tables are well arranged and figures are labelled well. Discussion: Well articulated References: Good</p> <p>In the final outlay;</p> <p>Ethics approval should appear at the end of the paper. Acknowledgement ; Include if there were funding derived and permission obtained from the institute authorities , if applicable Limitations of the study must be stated so as to send home a message i.e. can these results be applied to the whole population (as there are implications in therapy)</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	-	



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:	Sivalingam Nalliah
Department, University & Country	International Medical University, Malaysia