

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_100199
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Candida Species Isolated from Immuno-compromised Patients
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.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The manuscript is of great relevance to the scientific community, as it aimed to assess the prevalence of Candida species isolated from immunocompromised patients. The title will be appropriate to the study, if it is clarified whether all patients in the total sample were compromised or not. The abstract is not well understood as it says that candida isolates were obtained from 674 patients. But only 44 tested positive for this microorganism. Subsections are appropriate to the manuscript. However, some data need adjustments. Thus, it is necessary: <p>Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Update references, as there are citations of studies with more than a decade of publication; - Include the purpose of the study at the end of the introduction. <p>Methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Put the verbs in the past; - Include the age group of the research participants, as it is extremely important to know if there were children in the research. <p>Results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is important to emphasize that the majority tested negative for the presence of candida; - Include that 630 tested negative for candida; - In line 3 of the results, the computer data states that "patients with a weakened immune system represented all positive cases in total", but in the methodology it says that one of the inclusion criteria was to be immunocompromised. Therefore, this data only confuses the reader as to whether all participants would be in a state of immunocompromise or not. Make it clear if all patients were immunocompromised; - In Table 1, include a column with values referring to those who tested negative. This enriches the results and allows better analysis of the data by the readers; - What is the reason for the immunocompromise of patients between 11 and 30 years old? - Table 3 was made with the 674 patients and 1 and 2 not. The tables need to be standardized as to the total number of the sample. <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Were the study patients using any type of medication for a long time? Because the discussion informs that this is one of the risk factors. This data would be very important to understand the result of the research. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> For the manuscript to be scientifically adequate, the above inconsistencies must be resolved. The references need to be more updated, as the theme is very relevant and current. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Some corrections need to be made, mainly regarding verb tenses.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

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:	Welma Emidio Da Silva
Department, University & Country	Universidade Federal Rural De Pernambuco, Brazil