

**Review Form 1.7**

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Pathogen Research</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_ IJPR _109843</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>PREVALENCE OF Candida SPECIES AMONG HIV-INFECTED ADULT FEMALES AT MBODO HEALTH CENTER ALUU, RIVERS STATE, NIGERIA.</b>
Type of the Article	

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<p><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></p> <p>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p> <p>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></p> <p>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions for additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p> <p><b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b></p>	<p>1. This paper is important for the scientific community since it is a part of public health and infectious diseases. It focuses on Candida infections among HIV-positive females in a particular region. Highlights the correlation between immunocompromised states and increased susceptibility to fungal infection.</p> <p>2. The Prevalence of Candida Species Among HIV-Positive Women in Aluu, Nigeria: A Call for Awareness OR Revealing the Candidiasis Burden Among HIV-Positive Women in Aluu, Nigeria</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive.</p> <p>4. Yes, the subsets and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes it is scientifically correct. A critical evaluation might be needed to validate scientific accuracy.</p> <p>6. I feel like taking the references from the past 10 years minimum would be sufficient and not 20 years.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Methodology and Results the language could be more concise. Avoid using subjective and ambiguous statements. Overall the English language is appropriate for scholarly communication.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p><b>What do you think are the limitations of your study if you could list a few?</b> <b>Providing a rationale for each statistical approach used might improve the scientific rigor of the work.</b> <b>Any ethical issues?</b></p>	

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>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)</b>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Review Form 1.7**

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Arpita Meher</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Tbilisi State Medical University, Georgia</b>