



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:		
Specific comments:		
Title and abstract	The title and abstract are clear.	Thanks
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	The problem was well-defined. Clarify country of Nosocomial Infection National Surveillance Service.	DONE
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	Literature review was weak, see reference "Health-care-associated infection in Africa: a systematic review", <i>Bulletin of the World Health Organization</i> 2011;89:757-765.	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)	The authors used standardized criteria and definitions for the diagnosis of HAI, so that the results can be compared with similar studies. It wasn't clear if you reviewed only the record for the initial hospital visit, or if you were able to also review readmissions with SSI. Sometimes you talk about length of stay, and other times pre-operative or post-operative length of stay. Your intent in using this variable is not clear. Why did you analyze total length of stay? Did you consider analyzing this as a continuous variable?	THANKS ONLY INITIAL HOSPITAL VISITS NOT RE-ADMISSIONS CORRECTED-IT IS THE LENGTH OF POST-OPERATIVE STAYS. THE MEAN WAS REPORTED.
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	Only a small amount of data was analyzed. It is difficult to model the risk of infection with only 50 SSIs. You collected information on duration of surgery and wound class. Mention in results if these other variables were	--- DURATION OF SURGERY IS DEPENDENT ON THE SPECIALITY



SDI Review Form 1.5

appropriate statistical analyses been carried out?)	significant. Report a measure of model fit, such as the c-statistic. The discussion could use more details on how these results compare to other studies. There are 2 approaches that could be used. 1) Since you used NHSN definitions, you could calculate a standardized infection ratio. This way, you could report how much larger the SSI rate is than the NHSN standard, after controlling for differences in presurgical risk factors. or 2) You could provide more details about what the rates were in other developing countries. The discussion says that the study “supports the previously published results that an infection <u>following</u> the surgical intervention prolongs the length of hospitalization.” But that is not accurate if your variable was <u>total</u> length of hospitalization rather than <u>post-surgical</u> hospitalization. It is even more confusing that in the same paragraph you say reducing <u>pre</u>-operation bed stay may decrease SSI. Discuss the difficulty in using and interpreting this length of stay.	AND WAS NOT COLLECTED. WOUNDS WERE SIMPLY CLASSIFIED AS DIRTY OR NOT DIRTY. DONE----- USING THE BINARY LOGISTIC REGRESSION DONE----- BY COMPARING WITH OTHER DEVELOPING COUNTRIES CORRECTED-----POST OPERATIVE HOSPITALIZATION
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)	Yes, the conclusion is supported by the data.	THANK YOU SIR
References		-----