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**PART 1: Review Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compulsory REVISION comments</th>
<th>Reviewer's comment</th>
<th>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)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor REVISION comments</td>
<td>The MS as whole is well written, however, the text should be re-read carefully in order to try to avoid the repetition of the same sentence throughout the text, especially in the results section (i.e.: significant association, was statistically significant at p&lt;, the continuous use of subjects, etc). This reviewer considers that the article could be more interesting for readers if the text attracts the attention using synonymous (subjects = samples, patients, cases, etc; species = spp.). The description of the results is not attractive; maybe a Figure with the most significant results could be included. I noticed several expressions that should be modified with other which means the same but with a more scientific level, as well as connectors between the sentences in the results and discussion section to make the sense that the text is a continuous history instead of basic results recited one after another. In addition, this reviewer has detected some typographical errors. I read several instances of Candida not italicized.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Optional/General comments**

Specific comments related with the evaluation exposed above follow:

**INTRODUCTION:**

Line 22-24: Please change the following sentence “Others being *C. glabrata, C. krusei* and *C. tropicalis*. Most women can harbour Candida in their vagina [1,2] and yet be without symptoms.” Maybe something similar to “*C. glabrata, C. krusei* and *C. tropicalis* have been also described. Likewise, it is known that most women can harbour *Candida* in their vagina [1,2] which acts as an opportunistic microorganism.”

Line 39: Please change “yearly globally” and use a more enhanced expression like “In 1999, the WHO estimated a prevalence of 174 million new infections per year worldwide [16]”
## MATERIALS AND METHODS

Lines 67-68: The expression “or had been on antibiotics since commencement of symptoms” should be re-written. This reviewer suggests something like “Patients who had received any form of treatment were excluded.”

Please use synonymous of the word specimen throughout the text to avoid using the same word constantly. A

It is important to correct the use of the genus name “Candida” and write it in italics. Also the word “species” can be changed in some cases with “spp.”

Line 83: Se symbol centigrade must be in capital letter.

## RESULTS:

Line 94: The first sentence could be rewritten. “A total of 1240 subjects had specimens obtained from them at”

This reviewer considers that could be more appropriate a more formal expression like “A total of 1240 samples were obtained from patients attending the NDUTH…”

Please avoid using the same grammatical structures throughout the whole results section. Rewrite some sentences to avoid the dispersion of the reader while reading the text. For instance, “There was co-infection of *T. vaginalis* and *C. albicans* in 32 subjects (2.6%)” and express the same information in a different form like “Only 2.6% patients (32 cases) were co-infected with *T. vaginalis* and *C. albicans*”

It is mandatory to avoid the constant use of sentences like “There was no/also statistically significant association”

Tables: This reviewer considers necessary to include a brief explanation about what +ve means. Also P value should be in italics (*p* value).

## DISCUSSION:

This reviewer suggests a more in depth discussion not only comparing the results obtained with other previous studies. I will like a final paragraph in which the authors could transmit their impressions about the work and the importance of continuing doing this kind of epidemiological studies. The difficulties for this population and the risk to which women with trichomoniasis
are exposed in this region where VIH continues being a serious problem (one of the millennium goals are related with the reduction of VIH transmission and the STI controls are mandatory for this goal.

In lines 214-217: The authors explain that there is a higher prevalence in patients between 20-30 years; but this evidence is different to other studies published by Alo et al 2012. However the authors do not give an explanation or even a suggestion or hypothesis.

Line 226: Please change the expression “imperfect testing” with another less colloquial like “low accurate diagnostic methods”
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