

COMMENTS ON THE MANUSCRIPT (BJAST 2336)

General comment

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.

Specific comment

Abstract

Aims:

Line 39/40: I cannot comprehend how the role of MID in the spread of NIs can be measured/quantified.

Method:

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?

THE MAIN MANUSCRIPT

Introduction:

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**.

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. 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.

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.

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.

Reviewer’s Details:

Dr. Ajediran I. Bello
School of Allied Health Sciences,
University of Ghana.