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Reviewer's report:

It is good to see data from African countries as there is generally a lack of these, so I comment the authors for their contribution.

For a while, 'rumours' about the possible shifting from C. albicans to non-albicans candidas have been going around. That said, is it a shift or rather the lack of reporting on non-Candida species? The table comparing countries are compiled from various dates and the Ethiopian studies published within the last year or two thus I am not sure how to understand the shift scenario?

In the discussion the shifting scenario (pg 9) need to be better explained. The adding of the year the studies/reports were published could help the reader to comprehend how the author support this claim. For this Table 2 can be improved to explain the shifting scenario better, however, perhaps re-look at the data presented.

The reviewer suggest that 'Ethiopia' is added in the title of the manuscript as it will be more explanatory and inline with the aim of the study.

The study may be perceived as a bit of a mix between a review and an original research study so perhaps the author need to re-look at how he/she wants to present the data.

The english writing is not poor, but need to be corrected for grammatical and scientific publication nonetheless.

The author uses a number of journal references that may be a bit too old 1997-2007. There is relevance for some of these, but perhaps look at the latest data so that the work can be most relevant for a new publication.

The value of Table 4 is not well understood as most isolates are susceptible and the few resistant values can be described. Otherwise, I would rather suggest it as a supplement.

Content corrections:

"version 7.0 software, an advanced expert system (AES)"; provide the details of the supplier. Also, look at other places where the source of material is not fully reported.
A total of 209 yeasts were isolated from 776 different clinical samples (Table 1). Among yeast isolates 84 (40.2%), 52 (24.9), 42 (20.1%), 19 (9.1%) and 12 (5.7%) were isolated from vaginal swab, oropharyngeal swab, sputum, corneal, and nail scrapings, respectively. This is a very difficult writing style to read when adding consecutive values that need to be placed next to a long respective list of items. The author has several of these in the manuscript that can be rephrased for easier reading and comprehension.

The manuscript is full of fond/bold changes both in the text and tables that is probably erroneous.

Please correct C. krusei 15.6% (14/90X100), C. famata 14.4% (13/90X100), C. rugosa 11.1% (10/90x100), and C. lusitaniae 10.0% (9/90x100)- it is unclear what the brackets represent.

"The MIC values of voriconazole, caspofungin, micafungin and, flucytosine against C. krusei were 0.12-0.25, 0.12-0.5, 0.06-0.5, and 1, respectively": Are these MIC values or ranges?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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