

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_128284
Title of the Manuscript:	INVESTIGATION OF ANTIFUNGAL SUSCEPTIBILITY PROFILE IN FUNGI ISOLATED FROM PATIENTS WITH CHRONIC WOUNDS
Type of the Article	Short communication

#### PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript holds significant value for the scientific community as it sheds light on the often-overlooked role of fungi in chronic wound infections, particularly in venous ulcers. By investigating the antifungal susceptibility profiles of key fungal species such as <i>Candida tropicalis</i> and <i>Candida guilliermondii</i> , the study provides critical insights into the potential impact of fungal biofilms on wound healing processes. The findings highlight the importance of routine fungal culture and antifungal susceptibility testing in chronic wound management, which can inform tailored therapeutic strategies. This research contributes to a better understanding of fungal involvement in chronic wounds and underscores the need for integrated diagnostic approaches in wound care.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The current title is clear and adequately reflects the study's focus on antifungal susceptibility and fungal presence in chronic wounds. However, it can be slightly refined to enhance clarity and appeal. Suggested alternative title: " <b>Antifungal Susceptibility and Fungal Profiles in Chronic Wound Infections: A Focus on Venous Ulcers</b> ". This alternative emphasizes both the clinical and microbiological aspects of the study, making it more engaging while maintaining specificity.	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract is generally comprehensive and provides an adequate overview of the study's objectives, methods, findings, and implications. However, there are areas where it can be improved for clarity and completeness. Here are my suggestions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Background Information:</b> Provide a brief statement about the significance of studying fungi in chronic wounds to set the stage for the investigation.</li> <li><b>Specific Methodology:</b> Mention the number of patients and samples tested for clarity (e.g., "30 clinical samples from 10 patients").</li> <li><b>Detailed Results:</b> Include MIC values or a brief comparison of susceptibility between <i>Candida tropicalis</i> and <i>Candida guilliermondii</i> for a more complete summary.</li> <li><b>Implications:</b> Highlight the potential impact on biofilm formation and wound healing, as it is a key takeaway of the study.</li> <li><b>Conciseness:</b> Consider rephrasing for brevity, avoiding redundancy like "using the microdilution method following the EUCAST protocol," as this level of detail is better suited for the methods section.</li> </ol>	
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript appears scientifically sound overall, with a well-defined study design, appropriate methodology, and clear presentation of results. But it could benefit from stronger statistical analyses, larger sample size, a broader comparison with existing literature, and acknowledgment of limitations to enhance its scientific validity and impact.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	The manuscript includes a selection of references pertinent to the study of fungal presence and antifungal susceptibility in chronic wounds. However, to enhance the comprehensiveness and contemporaneity of the literature review, incorporating more recent and relevant studies is advisable. <p><a href="https://www.clinicalmicrobiologyandinfection.com/article/S1198-743X%2817%2930195-7/fulltext?utm_source=chatgpt.com">https://www.clinicalmicrobiologyandinfection.com/article/S1198-743X%2817%2930195-7/fulltext?utm_source=chatgpt.com</a></p> <p><a href="https://academic.oup.com/ofid/article/8/11/ofab444/6367646?utm_source=chatgpt.com&amp;login=false">https://academic.oup.com/ofid/article/8/11/ofab444/6367646?utm_source=chatgpt.com&amp;login=false</a></p> <p><a href="https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11908-022-00782-5?utm_source=chatgpt.com">https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11908-022-00782-5?utm_source=chatgpt.com</a></p>	

**Review Form 3**

	<a href="https://academic.oup.com/jacamr/article/4/3/dlac067/6618843?utm_source=chatgpt.com">https://academic.oup.com/jacamr/article/4/3/dlac067/6618843?utm_source=chatgpt.com</a>	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language quality is adequate for scholarly communication but would benefit from a thorough copy-editing process to address grammatical errors, improve sentence structure, and maintain a formal academic tone. These refinements will enhance the overall quality and readability of the article. Ensure consistency in the use of species names and technical terms (e.g., <i>Candida guilliermondii</i> is incorrectly spelled in one table and should be corrected to <i>Candida guilliermondii</i> ). Some sentences are overly long or complex. Breaking them into shorter, more concise sentences would improve readability.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Few I would like to mention which should be elaborated or mentioned in more details: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In 2.1 – Give details of the debridement method used</li> <li>2. In 2.2 – What is Levine's technique – please elaborate.</li> <li>3. In 2.3 – Elaborate/summarize the protocol used (from The Yeasts)</li> <li>4. In 2.4 – The link at the end - use as a reference, not in-line link</li> <li>5. Results and Discussion could have been written separately, would have made the results clearer.</li> <li>6. In Results and Discussion – the sentence "Dowd et al. (2011) also reported that 23% of patients with chronic wounds harbored fungi [14]" positioning is not correct. It should be mentioned in the first paragraph of Results &amp; Discussions.</li> </ol>	

**Comment [BC1]:** Line positioning is not correct, should have been at the first paragraph

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Bodhisatwa Choudhuri</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Parkview Super-Specialty Hospital, India</b>