



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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 Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
1. There is still a major flaw with the study as well as some flaws in the laboratory procedures. The authors only reported on the bacterial organisms that grow aerobically. The anaerobic organisms were not reported since the method used by the authors did not cater for the anaerobic organisms such as bacteriodes, clostridium etc. The authors should indicate this in their write up. 2. Also no fungi organisms were reported. Authors should also indicate that this were not sought for because of the lab methods they used and perhaps because of constraints in the lab they were not analyzed. NB: For the above two issues, the authors can simply use a sentence to indicate that their analysis sought to look for aerobic bacteria organisms associated with ssi in O&G wards. This also must be reflected on the title of the study which can read as follows "Aerobic bacteria from surgical wound infections in obstetrics and gynaecology ward in specialist hospital Sokoto – North West Nigeria". With such a title, it will be obvious to readers that authors from the onset set out to work on such bacteria. 3. I do not know the reason why the authors used nutrient agar, chocolate and MaConkey media plates excluding the most vital media, blood agar plates that is a primary universal media. 4. Authors kept using incidence rate in their analysis when in actual fact what was reported was just the frequency rate. For the incidence rate to be determined, the total number of admissions to the hospital and all positive cases has to be determined. 5. The reference section is horrible. I have highlighted in red colour some of the references that were incorrectly cited. Also, there has to be a consistent format to use by the authors in their citation. 6. The paper still needs editing for English grammar NB: I have made some editions and revisions in the attached file.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Patrick Akpaka
Department, University & Country	Dept. of Paraclinical Sciences, The University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad & Toabgo