



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_31284
Title of the Manuscript:	Surgical wound infections in Obstetrics and Gynecology ward in Specialist Hospital Sokoto – North West Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	1. Rephrase sentence on line 12 and 13 to read as follows "Infections following caesarean section causes prolonged hospital stay and there is a widespread aversion to caesarean delivery in Sokoto State". 2. Replace the word "operative" in sentence on line 20 with the word "microbiological" 3. The last sentence on line 26 should be rephrased to read as follows "<i>Staphylococcus</i> spp. was the most common aetiology or cause". 4. Delete "as" on line 35, change the words "commonly undergone" to "common" on line 57. 5. Revise the sentences on lines 64 – 66 to read as follows "Although there are various risk factors for surgical site infections, Bacteria remains the major cause of the infection, it does not occur in its absence. The higher the number of bacteria presents the higher the risk of infection (Laxminarayan <i>et al.</i>, 2013)". 6. Delete the sub section "Sample collection center" lines 76 - 84, it is irrelevant. Delete also sub section "Media preparation" lines 108 – 113, it is irrelevant. 7. Authors should please revise sub section – Bacteriological study of surgical sites, indicating the use of appropriate media for culture of clinical specimens. What is written in this section is not in agreement with conventional techniques. 8. Also what is written under sub section "Characterization of Bacterial isolates" on lines 135 – 146 have left so many questions to be answered. (a) What are the standard operating procedures of the laboratory that was followed? (b) The references – Cowan and Steel, 1974; and Cheesbrough, 1991 used here were not cited in the references. Besides, these two references are outdated for information needed in this section. (c) Authors wrote that odour was used for preliminary identification. Does this mean the plates were sniffed at to smell the odour. If this is so, it is	Agreed Agreed Agreed Agreed Agreed Agreed Noted Noted and appropriate corrections have been made. Noted and correction have been



SDI Review Form 1.6

	unscientific and unfortunate. 9. I have reservations as to how the incidence rate% and infection rate % on Tables 1 and 2 is calculated by the authors as 10.4. The total of % frequency on Table 4 is 100.1 10. On line 189, authors writes that Table 4 shows five (5) species of surgical site. Species refers only to organisms of the same genus or genera. 11. The word “distinguished” on line 197 should be replaced with “reported” or “identified”. 12. The discussion does not seem to flow and appears disjointed. 13. The authors should discuss some of the anticipated limitations of their studies. Without this it is very difficult to a significant conclusion as what is written in the conclusion appears not make a great sense.	made This error occurred in attempt to round up the figures to 1 decimal place. But noted and correction have been made. Thank you. Noted and correction have been made Agreed Noted and correction have been made
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		