

Review of: "Analysis of Vaginal Candidiasis Prevalence Among Bangladeshi Women in Relation to Menstrual Hygiene and Other Risk Factors: A Cross-Sectional Study"

Marleny Valencia Arredondo¹

¹ Universidad de Antioquia

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Introduction that is too extensive and with a lot of information that is not relevant to the study, including the entire definition of sexual health, the complications of different infections. They should focus on talking about the yeast infection and the complications. They refer to the entire microbiota, glycogen; in short, there is a lot of topic that has no place in the article, and even more so keeping in mind that it is a prevalence study, not a review of the topic. It is said that it is the analysis of the prevalence of vaginal candidiasis through a cross-sectional study, but the methodology is not clear; they do not specify that it was for convenience or how the participants were selected. They mention that there were women between prepubescent and postmenopausal, and then they say that only women of reproductive age or older were taken into account. In general terms, neither the methodology nor how they did the analysis is clear; they refer to 244 women, then they select only those who had candida, so how did they know what the prevalence is in the hospital? In the analysis plan, they do not specify how they will obtain the prevalence, what statistical measures will be used to analyze the risk factors and the presence of candida. They do not specify whether they will only do bivariate analysis and what statistical measures they will look at to define the possible association between infection and risk factors. If they took variables such as hygiene, type of protectors during menstruation, diabetes, use of antibiotics, why did they analyze it only in women with candida, and not with all of them to be able to make a comparison? In the results, they present too many tables and do not select the most important ones, resulting in an article that is too long and does not meet the general objective, which was the prevalence of

candida. There is no discussion but some conclusions that are too extensive. This article requires a reorganization of both structure and form to give it clarity and have results that are publishable and applicable to the population studied.