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The article reports results of a retrospectively studied of hepatosplenic candida abscesses in hematologic patients in a historical period in which, in Taiwan, the fungal prophylaxis during neutropenia was not indicated. 61 out of more than 2000 patients were identified, of which 30% resolve at 3 months and > 50% at six months. Septic shock was the only factor associated with death. The article is interesting even if some major points need to be reviewed:

1. about 74% of CDC diagnosis were possible that means suspicion on radiological findings. What are the more common radiological (TC) findings associated with CDC diagnosis? How many patients had TC findings not common? All patients underwent TC scan? How many underwent only to echography?

2. there are any data on beta-glucan study?

3. at univariate analysis CDC population was younger than no-CDC population, is a bias or you could explained this result?

4. an higher number of patients with invasive fungal pulmonary infection had also CDC. The authors considered this data associated with a possible genetic defect in the fungal immune response. Is a patient selection bias possible? Could other factors as type of chemotherapy, clinical stage severity (advanced disease, recurrence) or other factors of increased risk influenced CDC in this group of patients?

5. Again, at univariate analysis youger age, less than 65y, was positively associated with CDC. How the authors explain these data?

6. surprisingly neutropenia at CDC diagnosis was associated with resolution also this need a more profound explanation.
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