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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
The authors conducted an epidemiological study for HIV-negative Candida esophagitis (CE) retrospectively investigating the database of subjects who had health check-up. They found that the prevalence of CE was 0.4% and four factors such as age, alcohol consumption, steroid use and chronic kidney disease were independently associated with CE. The manuscript is well-written. My comments are as below. Major comments: 1. One subject was excluded due to positive HIV test from the analysis. However, it is unclear whether HIV test was performed for all the study subjects. Please clarify this point. 2. It is vague that steroid use includes what type of administration (i.e. systemic or topical). As the possible effect of acid-suppressive drugs are discussed in the discussion, it would be useful to add data on how many subjects were on PPI. 3. It seems difficult to take biopsies from all lesions suspected of candida esophagitis in the retrospective study. It needs to be addressed that how many subjects have candida esophagitis endoscopically without histological diagnosis.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Thank you for your submission on a commonly encountered endoscopic finding. The authors seek to identify the prevalence of Candida esophagitis among a population of HIV-negative individuals who undergo upper endoscopy and factors associated with Candida esophagitis. They identified a 0.4% prevalence of Candida esophagitis in their HIV-negative population, and the association between chronic kidney disease, steroid use, alcohol consumption. Several similar studies have been published evaluating factors associated with Candida esophagitis. The title, abstract, background, methods, and key words adequately describe the purpose and methods of the manuscript. I have the following questions, comments, and suggestions that I hope will improve the authors’ manuscript.

1. The authors purport a 0.4% prevalence of Candida esophagitis in Taiwan. However, it appears that their study was performed only at a single center at Kaohsiung Veterans General Hospital. Extrapolating nationwide prevalence of a condition from a single center is fraught with limitations and may not reflect true population prevalence due to regional variation of infections.

2. One limitation is the small sample size with only 47 individuals confirmed as having Candida esophagitis. Likely as a consequence of this small sample size and associated imprecision, the associations between steroid use or chronic kidney disease and Candida esophagitis have wide confidence intervals.

3. Immunosuppression beyond HIV, such as history of organ transplantation, is an important variable to include in the analysis.

4. The majority of their patients with Candida esophagitis was asymptomatic. There are some data suggesting that treatment may not be necessary for asymptomatic Candida esophagitis, which raises questions about the clinical utility of this information.

5. The
authors indicated that a questionnaire was filled out for every patient. It would be helpful to better understand the questionnaire. Is the symptom questionnaire a validated instrument? Are symptoms asked in a dichotomous (yes/no) manner or in a scale (always, sometimes, rarely, never)? 6. Was there any missing data? If so, how was missing data handled during the statistical analysis? 7. The authors use total examination fee as a surrogate for socioeconomic status. Does the medical center utilize a sliding scale fee schedule based on income? If so, clarifying this would be helpful as examination fee may vary depending on the types of interventions employed during the procedure. 8. The authors note that a positive HIV serologic test was an exclusion criterion. Did all patients undergo HIV testing? In other words, does this population include patients with confirmed HIV negative serologic test, or does it also include individuals who were never tested for HIV and are thus presumed to be negative? 9. The authors do a good job of discussing their findings in the context of previously published studies. 10. Minor comment: Correct the spelling of "Background" in the abstract.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
1. The authors revised the manuscript significantly. On the basis of their response to my comments, the following point needs to be added in the manuscript: the prevalence of esophageal candidiasis calculated for study subjects who underwent HIV test.