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Reviewer’s report:

This topic is interesting. The manuscript is well written and discussion is adequately supported by the data obtained in a cohort of patients and after modelization.

A prospective study would have been more powerful.

- Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The authors did not define enough the inappropriate therapy:
   - delay of > 24h: after positive culture? after yeast identification?
   - inadequate dose: what dose for fluconazole, 800 mg/d?
   - why is the inappropriate drug a third point?

2. Please clarify in the title that the study of the inappropriate treatment concerns empiric (or probabilist) therapy and no the curative therapy. What drugs are used in case of empiric therapy in their hospital?

3. The authors gave the crude mortality, is the attributable mortality available?

4. Can the authors specify the main causes of increased LOS: persistent fever? secondary localization? etc...

5. B-D-glucan detection is considered as rapid and promising diagnostic tool, however, it can not discriminate between yeasts and filamentous fungi, and therefore doesn’t allow the adaptation of the therapy to the fungus isolated before culture.

- Minor Essential Revisions

The author can be trusted to make these. For example, missing labels on figures, the wrong use of a term, spelling mistakes.

- Discretionary Revisions

These are recommendations for improvement which the author can choose to ignore. For example clarifications, data that would be useful but not essential.

Please note that both the comments entered here and answers to the questions below constitute the report, bearing your name, that will be forwarded to the
authors and published on the site if the article is accepted.
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