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Reviewer's report:

The authors performed a retrospective study on the Candida auris isolates in a single center in Pakistan. Candida auris is an hot topic and data from all over the world are needed to establish microbiological and clinical characteristics of infections and colonizations. Although the authors reported interesting data, the manuscript is difficult to read in this form and need several modifications to improve clarity. Please find below my comments:

MAJOR COMMENTS:

GENERAL: I suggest the authors to move all the tables and tables legeng at the end of the manuscript. In this form, it is very hard to read.

ABSTRACT: Background: It Should be changed specifying that the aim of the study was to assess clinical picture and outcome in Candida auris specimens from a single center in Pakistan; Methods: It is not clear to me why the authors describe this study as "cross sectional, retrospective". In my opinion, it is only retrospective. Please change in both the abstract and the methods section. They can also delete statistical software from the abstract; Results: Line 36 they mentioned comorbidities, but which one? Line 56: percentages for mortality seems to be different but the authors describe them as similar. Is there a p value to support their statement? Conclusions: Again, I believe that the authors should specify that their findings are related to specimens from a single center in Pakistan.


Line 53-56 pag. 4 In my opinion the authors should modify the final sentence of the introduction with (something similar): The aim of this study was to assess clinical and microbiological characteristics and outcomes of candida auris in Pakistan

METHODS: Line 8-9 pag. 5 Why cross-sectional? I suggest to leave only retrospective Line 25-52 pag 5: It is not clear to me why the authors describe microbiological culture and susceptibility testing in a paragraph like this. They report data from a retrospective study, so did they describe how cultures had been processed at the time of isolation? Or did they re-perform all the
culture for the purpose of the study? Leaving this paragraph in this way may be misleading because it seems like an observational prospective study. Please clarify.

Line 16-24 pag 7: It is not clear to me what does it mean "mortality and 14-day all-cause mortality"? Why the authors decided to consider 14-day mortality? and not 28-day mortality or 90-day mortality for ex. Please clarify. P.S. in general, I do not think that a retrospective descriptive study like this should have strict primary and secondary outcomes as an interventional prospective study.

Statistical analysis: Authors should explain the ration between "cases" and "variables" inserted in the multivariate model in order to check the stability of the model. How the authors selected the variables for the univariate analysis? Consensus?

RESULTS: In general, this paragraph is confusing. The authors should decide to report data in tables on in the paragraph. Please avoid repetition. There are several long tables with data, so they can decide to shorten the results paragraph.

Line 26 pag 8: Comorbidities should be better explained. "Had comorbidities" seems too general for a study aiming to describe clinical characteristics of Candida auris isolations.

DISCUSSION:
General: In my opinion, authors should start this paragraph summarizing what they did and highlighting the main findings. I also suggest the authors to increase the number of comparison between their data and data from other reports from other part of the worlds.

Line 6-7 pag 16: It is not clear to me if the authors used diabetes and malignancy as the only comorbidities to include in the model. Did the authors analyze other comorbidities? Please explain.

Line 4-5 pag 17: If mortality if the main outcome of the study, it should be described and commented at the beginning of the discussion.

Line 47-60 pag Another main limitation of the study is that we have no genetic information about the isolation. The authors did not provide genetic information regarding antifungal resistance and this limit the importance of the data. I suggest the authors to clearly specify and discuss this limitation.

CONCLUSION: In my opinion, conclusion paragraph is too long. The authors should describe only main finding. In my opinion, it is very important that they should report their conclusion to isolation from a single center in Pakistan.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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