



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_29386
Title of the Manuscript:	Identification of Virulence Factors Produced by Candida isolates from HIV seropositive and HIV seronegative pregnant women
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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Abstract Pg. 1, line 14 -15: It is rather puzzling that you screen 240 pregnant women and got 114 (47.5%) positive for HIV meanwhile the general prevalence of HIV in Nigeria is about 3%. Was it that you screened a large number of pregnant women and included 114 HIV seropositive and 126 HIV seronegative participants? Or were HIV pregnant women approached separately altogether? Introduction State the rationale for performing this study in pregnant women and those in their 3rd trimester in particular. Materials and methods Describe the method for recruiting participants. This will help clarify how you got so much HIV seropositive participants from a small sample. Discussion - The discussion is too long could be shorten. For example pg. 11, line 258 – 262 could be reduced to “The results in Table 2 show that 77.4% and 74% of the <i>C. albicans</i> and <i>C. glabrata</i> isolated from the vagina of HIV seropositive and seronegative participants respectively were positive for bile solubility.” - Compare your findings with those of similar studies performed in pregnant women.	240 pregnant women attending the antenatal clinics of the healthcare study centres were recruited for the study because they met the inclusion criteria which are: full consent, pregnancy at the third trimester and participation in the highly active antiretroviral therapy (HAART). Study participants were also required to keep all physician appointments throughout the study. Those who did not meet the above criteria were excluded. Some studies have reported vaginal candidiasis among pregnant women to be more symptomatic than in nonpregnant women (Hay P, Czeizel AE. Asymptomatic <i>Trichomonas</i> and <i>Candida</i> colonization and pregnancy outcome. Best Pract Res Clin Obstet Gynaecol 2007;21:403-9) Studies have revealed that different <i>Candida</i> species and types colonize the vagina, and prevalence rates rise from at least 20% of all women to 30% in pregnancy. The increase and severity of candidiasis in women have been shown to sustain pregnancy-related factors including immunologic alteration among sufferers,



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Please clarify the ethical issue: No, ethical approval was obtained.	increased estrogen level as well as increased vaginal glycogen production which are linked to pregnancy complications. However, adverse pregnancy complications have been reported to be highest at the third trimester of pregnancy (Ako-Nai <i>et al.</i>, 2013). Direct recruitment of participants was employed. HIV patients are often willing to participate in research more than controls. ALL OTHER COMMENTS RAISED HAVE BEEN ANSWERED. SEE REVISED TEXT. Ethical approval was obtained from the Ondo State hospital management and ethical board. Lines 77-78
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Abstract • Pg. 1, line 14: “One hundred and fourteen” not “Four hundred and fourteen” • Pg. 1, line 28 – 29, and Pg. 11, line 232 – 234, is rather contradictory to Table 2 owing that <i>Candida albicans</i> isolate from one HIV seronegative participant was observed to be haemolysin positive. Introduction Pg. 2, line 45 – 49 needs reference(s). Materials and methods • Pg. 3 line 74 – 75: “....Akure South and Ifedare local government areas in Ondo State in Nigeria...” • Pg. 4 line 89: delete “sample” • Pg.4, line 91 – 92; pg. 5 line 114 -115, and line 119 – 120: incubation were done at temperature? Results Pg. 7, line 179: start a new paragraph. Avoid repetition, see lines 181 – 187. Discussion Pg. 11, line 223 – 224 should be moved to the results section. Pg. 11, lines 233 – 234: one isolate was observed to produce haemolysin according to table 3. Avoid repeating the results in the discussion. Pg. 13, line 282: delete “our”	
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		