Reviewer’s report

Title: In vivo activity of Sapindus saponaria against azole-susceptible and -resistant human vaginal Candida species.

Version: 2 Date: 24 January 2011

Reviewer: thierry hennebelle

Reviewer’s report:

Major revisions:
I still do not understand how a figure that is described as the concentration (of the extract) “inhibiting 90% of the isolates” (MIC90) can be equal to the MFC, which is supposed to kill everything in your inoculums. A MFC should be a higher figure than the corresponding MIC, i.e. it is possible that you inhibit the growth of a fungus without killing it, but the contrary is rather unlikely! In your case, only 90% of the growth is inhibited, but 99.9% of the fungi are killed? I may not understand well, but you should really explain something about this. Usually MFC are higher than MIC (that is all the truer for MIC90), although they can be close. The MFC should be determined from a MIC100.

You have to understand that your appraisal of the results is rather optimistic. As a scientific paper can be (and is frequently) used to support human use, especially in the field of complement and alternative medicines, the manuscript still lacks precision. You chose to use very favorable figures defined by Duarte et al. I disagree with them. In my opinion it is better to compare your results with more challenging references to be perfectly honest with the chances of developing a new antifungal agent (which are low). Let us make it clear, your results are publishable, but not extraordinary.

There is also problems with English, e.g. “Also were made studies with purified and isolated substances. » : Does that mean studies will be made ?

In the present form there are too many problems with that manuscript for its publication.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.