



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART A:

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012/IJTDH/1769
Title of the Manuscript:	RATES AND RISK FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH SURGICAL SITE INFECTIONS IN A TERTIARY CARE CENTER IN SOUTH-WESTERN NIGERIA.

(Note: Title of different sections as proposed below may differ in case of review paper)



SDI Review Form 1.5

PART B: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part and write here 'Corrected' if not agreed, give suitable justifications)
General comment:	It is a 6-month retrospective study of SSI in one hospital in Nigeria. Data on nosocomial infections in Africa are limited. This is a strength of this manuscript.	THANKS SIR
Specific comments:	There are several concerns in the study (see below)	
Title and abstract		
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	This part describes the problem of healthcare acquired infection, and among them SSI, in US. References are old. Sometimes these infections are named surgical site infections, sometime they are named wound infections. After a long description of these infections in US, there is a small sentence "... few of this studies done in Africa." I would completely change the introduction describing the studies done in Africa. There is an important review done by WHO (Bagheri Nejad et al. Bull World Health Orga 2011) describing these studies in a systematic review.	RE-WRITTEN
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	References on SSI in African (and Nigerian) studies.	CORRECTED
Materials & methods (Kindly comment on the suitability of the methods. Sufficient details of the methods should be provided to allow peers to evaluate and/or replicate the work)	Who collected data? Were these people trained on definition, data collection, etc... in order to standardize the data entry? The authors should explain if they collected only in-patients' infections, or postdischarge surveillance was performed. What is "the ART clinic"? (line 115) Why the data were collected by interviewers? It was a retrospective study, was it not? What interview was done? Why risk index, according to NNIS, was not used?	THEY WERE DATA COLLECTORS----- -----CORRECTED IN THE TEXT AND EXPLAINED NO INTERVIEW WAS DONE
Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions should be based on actual facts and figures. Biased claims should be pointed out. 4. Are statistical analyses must for this paper? If yes, have sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)	Type of operations is not described Line 177: what does it mean "we found clean wounds in 26% and contaminated wounds in 74%" The authors found that among HIV infected individuals the rate of SSI was 45.5%. This is an important point. A description of interventions, and all variables should be done In the text (and in the table) it is not reported how many infections occurred in how many clean, clean-contaminated, contaminated and dirty interventions, respectively. Table 2 is sometimes 1 in the text	TYPE OF OPERATION REFLECTED IN DEPT OF CARE SIR. ---CONTAMINATED WOUNDS HAS BEEN DELETED. HIV DISCUSSED AS ONE OF THE PRE-EXISTING CONDITION OF IMMUNOCOMPROMISE



SDI Review Form 1.5

Are there any ethical or competing interest issues?	No	-----
Conclusion (Is the conclusion supported by the data, discussed inside the manuscript? Conclusions should not be biased and should be based on the data, presented inside the manuscript only)	Conclusions should be rewritten and simplified.	DONE
References	Old.	UPGRADED