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Reviewer's report:

This study investigated the prevalence and distribution of Candida species collected from infants in the Jordan University Hospital over a period of ten months. After conducting species identification, the authors investigated the production of extracellular aspartyl proteinases, the susceptibility to antifungal drugs, and the genotypes of the isolates.

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. For Figure 1, it will be prudent for the authors to provide the electrophoresis results leading to the dendrogram. Alternatively, those data can be included in the supplement.

2. In the Methods, it is necessary to provide the information of the genes or regions of sequences targeted for PCR amplification. It is very difficult for the readers to find out the targets with only the sequences of the primers available.

Minor Essential Revisions:

3. In the result, the authors stated “…whereas 97% of Candida species isolates were susceptible to fluconzaole…” and stopped short of mentioning the species of the 3% (The authors did mention it in discussion. They were all of C. glabrata.). Instead of expecting the readers to figure it out from the tables or to wait till into the section of Discussion, it would help to point out the species of those 3% isolates in the section of Results. In fact, this is a common issue for the Results. It is too brief and the section of Discussion is more like “Results and Discussion”.

4. In Tables 3 and 4, the authors showed the drug susceptibility and production of proteinase, phospholipase, and hemolysin for all Candida isolates. Will the authors determine whether the sites of isolation (oral or rectal) can be correlated to the results of drug susceptibility and the production of proteinase, phospholipase, and hemolysin?

5. In Table 4, there were statistical p values for the analyses concerning proteinase and phospholipase, but stated “not done” for hemolysin. Will the authors complete the analysis or provide a reason as why it could not be done?

6. Please pay additional attention to issues of spelling and grammar.

Discretionary Revisions

7. There are two copies of Figure 1.
8. In page 8, line 1: (12.1%) should be 12.1%.
9. The title of Reference 20 is not in bold.
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**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published
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