



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_25465
Title of the Manuscript:	Molecular identification of Candida dubliniensis among Candida albicans isolated from oral cavity of cancer patients using PCR-RFLP, in a tertiary care hospital in Kashmir, India.
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	This paper is interesting when discussing the different methods to differentiate <i>Candida albicans</i> x <i>Candida dubliniensis</i>, and brings a review of the non isolation of <i>C. dubliniensis</i> in HIV-negative patients. The study was conducted from clinical samples from cancer patients. However this issue is mentioned in item Ethical Approval.	The isolates were recovered from clinical samples in a previous study which was approved by the ethical committee of SKIMS. In the current study, the above isolates preserved in stock were used without any reference to the patients' identity. Ethical approval was sought for using these strains in this study.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. In the abstract the authors state that the study period was from October 2013 to October 2014. However, nowhere in the text this information is mentioned. 2. The words "cancer patients" are mentioned only in the title of the paper, unless I am mistaken. 3. In the lines 148-149, the authors cite: "The time to identification by PCR-RFLP can further be reduced by faster extraction of DNA from isolates using commercial kits, multiplex PCR and RAPD methodologies." It was not clear to me how the RAPD methodology can reduce the time of identification by PCR-RFLP. 4. The explicit statement in lines 171-172 must be checked because the cited reference refers to an investigation conducted in HIV-positive patients and not in patients with head and neck cancer, as the authors state.	Mentioned in L 68 Already mentioned in L 54, 55, 59, 153 Sentence reframed in L150,151,152 The reference No. 31 quoted was wrong. The correct one has been added instead of the previous one.



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments	1. Forms of citation of references, especially in the discussion, need to be adjusted.	Has been done as per the journal instructions and highlighted.
---	--	--