



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	British Journal of Applied Science & Technology
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/BJAST/2336
Title of the Manuscript:	AN INVESTIGATION OF X RAY EQUIPMENT AND ACCESSORIES AS POSSIBLE VECTORS OF NOSOCOMIAL INFECTION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS IN ANAMBRA STATE, NIGERIA.

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The strength of this paper rests on the detection of some nosocomial infections on the X-ray machines and their accessories in both private and Government Hospitals, given the spread of this infections within hospital environment. Although, this has been reported by the previous authors, enviromental factors and the modes of operation in different health care settings can make a different! However, the authors needs to remain focussed on the actual needs for this study in order to appreciate the intent of the manuscript. In addition, the entire abstract is bereft of statistical tool both for comparison of figures and presentation of data. The Bacteria isolated could also be presented empirically. Authors need to state briefly the statistical tool used for the data analysis. The authors did not state the problem statement for the study throughout the whole introduction. More so, they have clearly stated that the previous investigations have shown positive results for the infections. As such, one wonders why the study was necessary in the first place. There should be a relevant statement to show the necessity for this study. In addition, there was no section for data analysis, even if it was a simple descriptive statistics, this should be so stated.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments	Line 39/40: I cannot comprehend how the role of MID in the spread of NIs can be measured/quantified. Line 45/46: Author should recast the phrase written as “at the end of the work, for the days selected for the selection of samples” thus “at the end of each selected working days for sample collections. Results Line 56 & 57: The number of each pathogen isolated should be stated in figures Line 61 & 62s: Authors should present the relative prevalence of the pathogens at private and Government Hospitals, in figures Conclusion Line 68/69: It should be clarified whether occupational infections were also investigated in this study or it is the same as nosocomial infections? Line 79: Authors should remove the initials from the in-text reference; Paul Dorio, 2011. Line 83: Authors should revise the second phrase; ‘Such patient condition’ to avoid repetition of the previous phrase in line 82.	This can be done by establishing that the pathogens that cause these infections are present on the equipment and accessories used. Sterile swab sticks were used to swab the surfaces of selected x-ray equipment and accessories at the close of work. . Bacteria isolated were ; staphylococcus aureus (140), pseudomonas auregenosa (88), proteus spp (28), streptococcus (52) and coliform spp(80). . Bacteria isolated had a higher prevalence in government ; 96 samples (48%) than in private;76samples (38%) health institutions. Occupational infection was used to mean the same thing as nosocomial infection and avoid confusion it has been removed from the revised manuscript. . Dorio, 2011. ‘These patient conditions’
---------------------------------------	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 96: Nosocomial infection was wrongly spelled, author should revise this. More over, an abbreviation NI could be used throughout the section since it has been introduced earlier in line 92. Line 95 & 98: Presentation of in-text references in this way is not acceptable in scientific writing. Authors should simply write Wikipedia and the year, and write the detail in the list of references. Line 111: The word preceding the reference should be written as 'wards' and not 'words'. Line 132-134: The first part of the aim under the introduction is not consistent with what was written in the abstract. The authors were to find out whether the X-rays machine and its accessory actually harbour NIs under the abstract, whereas, the aim under the introduction is stressing the most frequently encountered NIs. whereas, the aim under the introduction is stressing the most frequently encountered NIs. This should be harmonized by the authors. Results: Line 173 through 178: The result section should be presented with figures. Although caution should be taken to avoid duplication of Table contents, the few results presented should be empirical Line 184 through 187: The same comment as above	Nosocomial Wikipedia 2012 Wards This should be harmonized by the authors.The aim was to investigate whether x-ray equipment and accessories harbour nosocomial pathogens,and also to determine the prevalence of these pathogens in public and private health institutions in Anambra state, Nigeria. It showed that x-ray recorded the highest number of growth(32). X-ray cassette recorded the highest number of growth(28) . X-ray cassette had the highest bacterial load for staphylococcus aureus (44), pseudomonas aeruginosa (40), streptococcus (24) and coliform spp (36).
--	--	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 193 through 109: All inner lines of the tables should be removed except the top inner line. Discussion: Line 222: The phrase stated as “as shown in Table IV” should be deleted.	Correction has been reflected in the revised manuscript. As shown in table iv has also been removed from the revised manuscript.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Decision. In view of some issues raised about the documentations of the findings in this study. I recommend that the author re-package the manuscript, taking into cognizance all comments/corrections indicated.	