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Reviewer's report:

1. Personally, I do not like the use of too many abbreviations. In particular, I do not like the abbreviation CIC (Candidemia/Invasive Candidiasis). In this particular setting, this abbreviation gives the reader the false impression that anidulafungin has a demonstrated activity in deep seated candidiasis (invasive candidiasis), which is not true. There were only 26 cases of "deep-seated candididiases with candidemia" out of 245 candidemias in the original study.

2. As I said before, these data are already known. For this reason, I do not think it is necessary to repeat the methodology in details.

3. Among the criticism that was made after the publication of the registration study, there was the issue of the lack of a multivariable analysis of factors associated with response to treatment. We have this analysis here, and this is good.

4. In the introduction, the Authors report briefly the results of the original anidulafungin vs fluconazole study. They say that anidulafungin showed to be superior to fluconazole. As they know very well, this conclusion was actually questioned by some researchers, given the non-inferiority trial design and the large non-inferiority margin. I think it would be worthwhile to mitigate the sentence about superiority or at least to add a sentence recognizing the existence of some controversy about the superiority or non-inferiority issue. Something like "Although this conclusion was criticized by some experts because on the non-inferiority design, .."