



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_30491
Title of the Manuscript:	Occurrence of bacteriuria amongst inmates of Federal Neuropsychiatric Hospital Calabar, Nigeria.
Type of the 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	The abstract is vague, particularly the aim, study design, place and duration of study and sample. The aim should be to determine the occurrence and prevalence of bacteriuria among inmates of Federal Neuropsychiatric Hospital, Calabar. The author should look in depth into the study design. That is not how to present study design. Place and duration of study can be better put like this "The study was carried out at Federal Neuropsychiatric Hospital, Calabar for a period of one year or between August, 2010 and September, 2011". Why do the author limit the urine sample to 200 from inmates and 100 from healthy staff. The sampling method is questionable. The use of urinary tract infections (UTI) which was define for the first time. Subsequently, the use of UTI should be used. There is inconsistency in that respect.	These corrections have been effected. Thank you This correction has also been effected This research was done on asymptomatic patients.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The references used by the authors are too old. There are more recent studies they can use. Under introduction, line 4 ... that the urinary tract infections (UTIs) are... It should be that urinary tract infections... The aim as earlier said is not in agreement with the title of the work. Look at very well. Under materials and methods- subjects and consent, line 2, ..attending physicians to be a bit normal i.e. ... the phrase a bit normal is not very clear. Informed consent should be a written document, and	Old references have been replaced with newer ones. This has been corrected. The aim has been corrected to be in agreement with title. The word "verbally" has been expunged. Most of the patients were not mentally normal. "unharmful" has been replaced with "harmless" "The age, sex and hospital form numbers" has been expunge. the first sentence in the result has been



SDI Review Form 1.6

	not stated verbally. The grammar in line 6 of subjects and consent the 'unharmful nature' should be replaced with a better grammar. Under collection of samples, it should be rephrase and the last sentence 'The age, sex, and...' should be expunge. Under results, the first sentence 'Of the 200 to was carried out' should be expunge. Some spelling mistakes, errors, capitalization like <i>klebsiella</i> should be <i>Klebsiella</i> . Too many tables that are not needed. Beside, these tables can be better presented in the form of pie charts and bar charts. The bar chart used is too clumsy. Under discussion, from line 1 to line 6, there will be no need for such statement. There is not consistency in the use of et al. Some were italicized, while others were not. Under references, there are lots of inconsistencies ranging from arranging the names of authors to the use of 'and' or '&' by the authors. Ethical issues: Since this is a clinical research using samples from human subjects, the need for written informed consent is needed. Therefore, authors/researchers are advised to get written informed consent from these patients.	expunge. These mistakes and errors have been corrected. Line 1 to 6 under discussion has been expunged. This has been done. Informed consents were gotten from patients who were able to co-operate with the researchers or guardians who were available
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		