



SDI Review Form 1.6

+

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2014_IJTDH_11908
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Candiduria in infants from a tertiary care hospital
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The incidence of nosocomial infections (NI) caused by Candida sp. have increased dramatically in recent years, are the most common fungal infections in hospitalized patients and is the fourth most common cause of NI with hematogenous route of entry into the United States of America. Candida albicans is generally more prevalent in pediatric intensive care units with 53% of isolated cases next most common, non-albicans species such as Candida tropicalis and Candida parapsilosis while Candida glabrata and Candida krusei are rare. So it is necessary to implement strategies in the prevention and prophylaxis in children at high risk of nosocomial Candida infections. However, the authors should consider certain points in order to publish their data: General comments: The work lacks a scientific weight, and the way of writing seems to be a short communication,	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Major comments • introductory paragraph, in the context of work no epidemiological data from the study area / country where the work or candida albicans was performed are mentioned, or for any other species • Material and methods 1). are written in concise manner, there is no data to ensure the reproducibility of results in a matter of techniques used. 2). not mentioned if obtaining informed consent from the adult responsible for the child was made. 3). Sabouraud Dextrose Agar is a general-purpose medium designed for growing dermatophyte A low pH (approximately 5.6) favors the growth of fungi, particularly the dermatophytes, with slightly inhibitory effect for contaminating bacteria in clinical specimens. Would be wise to mention if some other dermatofito successfully isolated? 4). Specific nomenclature should be mentioned including its abbreviation as is the case of ICU, SDA slant. 5). not mentioned if we carry out quality control in accordance with local, state	1. In introduction, epidemiological data has been incorporated. 1. Semiquantitative technique was not used, however the samples of urine which grow candida were repeated to assess its significance. 2. Informed consent was taken in the ward from where the samples were sent. 3. In our study, no dermatophyte was grown. 4. Same has been incorporated. 5. Everytime the media is prepared; ATCC strains of <i>C.albicans</i>, <i>C.</i>
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	and / or national, and the requirements of accreditation bodies and standard procedures for laboratory quality control. 6). does not exist or a statistical method used is not mentioned 7). not mentioned as the number of samples employed in this work was determined • Results 1. Confidence indices do not exist. 2. no mention of a possible relationship of percentage of infection of different species of candida in relation to gender of the infants. 3. generally no statistical analysis is not presented • Discussion The discussion is not consistent to work and does not exist a conclusion based on the findings of work	<i>tropicalis</i> and <i>C. krusei</i> were tested. 6. Data entered in the Microsoft excel sheet and the percentages were calculated. 7. No. of urine samples of infants received during the study period. 2. Different species in relation to gender has been incorporated in the table. 3. Same has been incorporated. Conclusions have been focussed on the results and same has been incorporated in the discussion.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Please clarify the ethical issue, if any	