

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	Yes, it's important Yes Ok Conclusion is missing Needs some corrections (Methods – 1. Explain clearly how much blood sample was collected in paediatric patients and adult patients, why do you need for anaerobic culture, etc., 2.2.1 Isolation and identification of Candida 2. Why you are using Standard bacteriological tests? You are identifying Candida spp.) 2.2.2 Antifungal susceptibility testing 3. It would be better if authors explain the procedure of YST and AST on Vitek-2 system clearly.) Sufficient and recent	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Ok Gram-stained bottles were examined, and afterward, subcultures were created.	
Optional/General comments	Results: It is better, If authors distributed the patients according to the location (ICU; NICU, PICU, SICU, etc.,)	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sanjeev Kumar
Department, University & Country	Shantabaa Medical College & General Hospital, Saurashtra University, India