

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_97091
Title of the Manuscript:	Candida bloodstream infection and antifungal susceptibility over three years in a single center from Medinah, Saudi Arabia
Type of the Article	Original Research 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:

(<https://www.journalmrji.com/index.php/MRJI/editorial-policy>)

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes. Yes. Minor modifications as mentioned in article.</p> <p>Yes. Conclusion is missing. I suggest to summarize results and highlight the significance of these <i>Candida</i> species distribution and resistance antifungal patterns to a better control of candidemias on this healthcare unit. All other sections of the manuscript are correct and well designed.</p> <p>References in the text should be cited as numbers (Ex: line 4 of the first paragraph: "... and exposure to invasive procedures [1,2].").</p> <p>Yes. Methods are very well explained and suitable for this kind of research. As the research was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic, I suggest two references that can be added to improve the article scientific value:</p> <p>1- A research conducted in Saudi Arabia, revealing the correlation between the use of central-line catheters and <i>Candida</i> infections, and the effective results after correct antifungal therapies: Aldawood F, El-Saed A, Al-Zunitan M, Alshamrani M. Central line-associated bloodstream infection during COVID-19 pandemic. J Infect Pub Heal, 2021; 14: 668-669. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1876034121000332</p> <p>2- A research with an overview of <i>Candida</i> infections in COVID-19 pandemic: Norberg CMBM, Norberg PRBM, Norberg AN, Matos AAL, Sanches FG, Manhães FC, Mangiavacchi BM et al. <i>Candida</i> infections associated with COVID-19: an underestimated risk. WJPPS 2021; 10(9): 48-64. https://www.wjpps.com/Wjpps_controller/abstract_id/14962</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	It needs an English grammar review after general adjustments.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	A well-designed study, with valuable results in terms of Public Health. Congratulations to the authors.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

[Review Form 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Antonio Neres Norberg
Department, University & Country	São Carlos Metropolitan School, Brazil