



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:	The manuscript is unclear-written and redundancies. The paper may need to be concise and linguistic assistant. However, it could benefit from revision as indicated in the detailed comments following.	
Specific comments:	The authors should clearly understand about the word SSI and SWI. Currently, SSI was used instead of SWI. The definitions of these two words were a bit difference. In addition, HAI was used instead of NI. Please see the details of other comments below.	
Title and abstract	Background: should point out gap of knowledge. Methods: unclear study period (six months or one month). Abbreviations should not be used for January and February. Setting: the authors should say six surgical departments in.....hospital. Results: should re-organize, the authors may start with number of operations, number of infections, incidence rates, pathogens, and risk factors (only significant factors should be presented). Conclusion: should relate to the results and give some suggestions.	
Introduction (Is the problem/objective of this study original, important and well defined?)	Relationship of the topic to previous research and existing literature is unclearly described. Gap of knowledge is unclear. It should be re-organized written. I suggest that the authors may start with the incidences of SSIs global, national, and local levels. Then, they may present the impact of SSIs, gap of knowledge, and objectives of this study. The magnitude of the problem (number, percentage, cost in \$US,...) should be clearly and concisely presented.	
Are all the references cited relevant, adequate? Are there any other suitable current references authors need to cite?	Most citations are out of date.	
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)	Study population, study sample, and study period are unclear. Study location (setting) should be concise written. The authors may present only the information from lines 107-110. In addition, the hospital size should be presented (how many beds). Data collection: the validity and reliability of data should be presented such as who collect the data, who diagnose SSI, the current CDC definition should be used (CDC/NHSN surveillance definition of health care-associated infection and criteria for specific types of infections in the acute care setting. Am J Infect Control 2008;36:309-32).	
Results & discussion (Kindly comment on: 1. Are the data well controlled and robust? 2. Authors should provide relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and	Results in texts should be concise written. Impact of SSIs do not relate to the objective of this study. Demographic data should be compared between SSIs and non-SSIs patients (Table 1 and table 2). Risk	



SDI Review Form 1.5

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?)	factors, ORs and 95% CIs from univariate analysis and multivariate analysis should be presented in Table 3. Reference groups should be re-considered such as non-existent disease and LOS <7 days should be the references groups. Non-existent disease should be used instead of nil. The major issue is that some potential risk factors or confounding factors such as prophylaxis antibiotic, blood glucose level, hair removal methods, wound class, ASA score, duration of operation, and type operative procedures are not included in the model. In addition, I think LOS is not the risk factor, but it should be the consequence of SSI. Discussion should be related to the objectives and results of the study. The strengths and weakness of the study (such as small sample size, retrospective design) should be pointed out.	
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 appropriately stated based on the results. In addition, the implications of the findings for perioperative practice, policy, or further research should be clearly stated.	
References	Most references are out of date.	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer