

**Reviewer Recommendation and Comments for Manuscript Number
PONE-D-23-13143**

Article Title:	Molecular Identification of <i>Candida auris</i> by VITEK 2 and ITS-1 and ITS-2 regions of rDNA to early detect and limit infection in hospital setting of Lahore, Pakistan
Comments & Recommendations:	The title of the article is not suitable and it should be revised because the author did not identify any single isolate as <i>Candida auris</i> by any technique. However, she tried to screen the <i>C. auris</i> in the samples. One of the proposed title in my opinion is, “ Screening of <i>C. auris</i> among <i>Candida</i> isolates from various tertiary care institutions in Lahore by VITEK 2 and real time PCR based molecular technique ”.
Methodology:	The author collected <i>Candida</i> isolates from different tertiary care institution of Lahore and screened them for the presence of <i>C. auris</i> by testing Fluconazole @ 25µg.
Comments & Recommendations:	It may be mentioned here that Minimum Inhibitory Concentration for <i>C. auris</i> is known to be $\geq 32\mu\text{g}$, therefore if any one desired to screen on the basis of fluconazole resistance then the used concentration should be appropriate. Moreover, the best antifungal activity against <i>C. auris</i> is known by the use of Echinocandins (Please refer Sanyaolau <i>et al.</i> , 2022; https://doi.org/10.3947/ic.2022.0008). Therefore, the author is advised to screen Echinocandins rather than Fluconazole. More references may be found if properly searched.
Results:	The author mentioned that she screened 636 <i>Candida</i> isolates and for fluconazole resistance and found resistance in 248 (38.9%) isolates, and identify 87 isolates as different <i>Candida</i> species on the basis of VITEK 2 ID Compact System and performed RT-PCR on selected isolates (n=100).
Comments & Recommendations:	The author did not mention the criteria for selecting 87 and 100 isolates rather than testing all 248 fluconazole resistant <i>Candida</i> isolates. However, she is claiming that <i>C. auris</i> could not be identify from collected samples. It is suggested that to author to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Screen isolates resistant isolates using echinocandins or any other or appropriate concentration of fluconazole antifungal. • Test all resistant <i>Candida</i> isolates or all collected isolates using VITEK 2 ID Compact System and RT-PCR. • The author is also advised to use any control sample (positive control) for comparing the amplification on RT-PCR.

Statistical Analysis:	The author did not perform any statistical analysis
Comments & Recommendations:	The author is advised to” <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mention the name of institutes form where the samples were collected with exact numbers and gender.• The data may be classified into various institutes/hospitals and gender (male & female).• The data may analyze statistically in terms of means, standard error and standard deviation.
Overall Comments & Recommendations:	The manuscript may be sent to author for major revision. The manuscript may be accepted after incorporating all the comments.