

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_125001
Title of the Manuscript:	Detection of mutated erg11 and fks1 genes among resistant Candida species isolated in pregnant women in Mbarara, Uganda
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION 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)
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This research can prove to be very useful in the medical field for the future. Now a days, an important factor that can cause therapeutic failure is antifungal drug resistance of the infecting <i>Candida</i> sp. So, if scientists get an idea of the resistant mutated genes in advance, they can make better antifungal drugs against fungal infections.</p> <p>SEE ATTACHMENT</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title of the article is absolutely appropriate.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is not comprehensive and appropriate.</p> <p>Suggestions:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The background part of abstract is very poor and not appropriate, author should change it. 2) Out of the 90 <i>Candidates</i> isolates recovered, 56% (50) were <i>Candida albicans</i> and 44% were non-<i>Candida albicans</i>, this line is unclear in abstract, which non-<i>Candida</i>? Because many non- <i>Candida</i> species do not cause infection. Author should mention in abstract the isolation of non-<i>Candida albicans</i> sp. 3) Author should explain in abstract how many patients and hospitals were studied to recovered 90 <i>Candida</i> isolates? 	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The subsections and structure of the manuscript is appropriate.</p>	
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>Here the MS is scientifically correct because the research is recent and shown on scientific basis. Because if we look at the current scenario, fungal infections are increasing day by day. That's why it is very important to detect mutated genes in fungus for future impact.</p> <p>Technical points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Check the manuscript thoroughly as at some places there is no space in between the words. ➤ Cite some papers of International STD Research and Reviews journal where ever possible. ➤ Author should check the format of MS is according to the journal format or not. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p> <p>=</p>	<p>The references given in the MS are not sufficient and recent. To improve the quality of MS, author must cite some more new references from 2018- 2024 in his/ her MS.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Jeffrey M Rybak ¹, Christina A Cuomo ², P David Rogers. The molecular and genetic basis of antifungal resistance in the emerging fungal pathogen <i>Candida auris</i>. Current Opinion in Microbiology Volume 70, December 2022, 102208. 2. Lee, Y., Robbins, N. & Cowen, L.E. Molecular mechanisms governing antifungal drug resistance. <i>npj Antimicrob Resist</i> 1, 5 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1038/s44259-023-00007-2 3. Schikora-Tamarit, M.Á., Gabaldón, T. Recent gene selection and drug resistance underscore clinical adaptation across <i>Candida</i> species. <i>Nat Microbiol</i> 9, 284–307 (2024). 	

Review Form 3

	https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-023-01547 .	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable. Suggestion:- Thoroughly check again the language of the manuscript.	
Optional/General comments	Some more important comments:- 1) The author has more focused on caspofungin and fluconazole antifungals in his/her research article. Is there any other antifungal like itraconazole, Ibrexafungerp, Echinocandin or other azoles etc. to which the mutant <i>Candida</i> is additionally resistant? If yes, then mention it in the introduction part with some citations. 2) A total of 90 clinical isolates used were previously collected----- this line is unclear in materials and methods, what does previously mean in this? Author should either explain or remove this word in MS. 3) Author should change this heading " Retrieval of Archived <i>Candida</i> isolates " 4) In the results of MS, author has not listed non- <i>Candida</i> isolates in decreasing order of their percentage frequency, author should change it. 5) The distribution of <i>Candida</i> sp. given in Figure-1 are not clearly visible, author should change them. 6) The author has not italicized <i>Candida</i> in many lines of MS, Author should check it. 7) Discussion part is weak as the author has not compared their result with already published recent results in Uganda or other countries.	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with the 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 detail)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Pankaj Kumar
Department, University & Country	Kurukshetra University, India