

ReviewForm 1.7

JournalName:	AsianJournalofResearchinInfectiousDiseases
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_AJRID_108159
TitleoftheManuscript:	AstudyofClinicaland microbiologicalprofileof esophagealcandidiasisin ateriarycarecenter:Observationalstudy
Typeofthe Article	OriginalResearch Article

ReviewForm 1.7

PART1:ReviewComments

	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"> 1. Isthe manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Isthe title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Isthe 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The manuscript has scientific relevance, at an epidemiological level it provides current causes of clinical relevance. 2. Suggested title: Clinical and microbiological profile of esophageal candidiasis in a tertiary care center: observational study 3. Yes, it is complete 4. The structure and sequence are appropriate 5. It does not comply with due scientific rigor, the use of informed consent from patients has not been indicated, nor the acceptance of any ethics committee or reviewer from the relevant institutions, nor is the issue of confidentiality of patient data mentioned. 6. The references are insufficient and are old, most of them more than 20 years old, there are recurrent references. <p>For the approval of the article, it is suggested to improve the writing of the methodology, in addition to including the criteria of scientific rigor: confidentiality and informed consent in addition to the approval of the ethics committee of the institution where it was carried out or of the institution that approved the project. The bibliography must be updated in its entirety, so the discussion would also change.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The writing of the methodology must be improved.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

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

[ReviewForm 1.7](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Tania Belú Castillo Cornock
Department, University & Country	University of San Martín de Porres, Perú