

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

Dr. Sinjini Sarkar¹

¹ Narsee Monjee Institute of Management Studies

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The first major technical drawback that was found is the lack of informed consent obtained from patients. If verbal informed consent was taken, then how are they documented and archived? There is no information regarding the Ethical Clearance certificate and its issue number mentioned in the study. Moreover, I am not sure if ages 15-17 can be ethically included. If so, then an institutional ethical recommendation certificate is mandatory.

Other points to improve the manuscript:

1. Summarize the introduction in approx. 500-800 words. In its current form, it looks like a lit review for a thesis, not a publication.
2. Delete the sentence "Patients ranged in age from pre-puberty to well into menopause" from "Area of Study and Participants." "I" should not be used in the manuscript. "Area of Study and Participants" is not well written. It should be concise and to the point. It seems like the researcher has obtained verbal communication from everywhere and conducted the study without ethical clearance, thereby violating a major guideline for clinical research.
3. Vaginal candidiasis is very rare in pre-puberty, and if included in the study, should be excluded. Write defined inclusion and exclusion criteria. Patients should be recruited under the physician's discretion according to the eligibility criteria, not just by verbal request.
4. Cross table analyses were performed without the Pearson Chi-square test for significance. Instead of creating multiple tables, it is advised to perform the Pearson Chi-square and only prepare 2-3 tables for significant parameters. The p-values should be mentioned. Parameters that are not significant can be written in a paragraph without tabular representation. Some frequencies can be represented in charts.
5. Results should be concisely written, and there is no need to describe everything in the tables.
6. References are extremely old in the discussion and conclusion and must be updated.
7. Reference formatting is also poor. Only one style should be followed.

Unless these major changes are made, it is difficult to publish the paper, even with its potential and with such interesting and important observations.

