

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_83863
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge and Awareness about Wound Infection after Surgery among Population in Saudi Arabia
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:

(<https://www.journaljpri.com/index.php/JPRI/editorial-policy>)

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	<p>The idea behind the study is interesting and the sample size gives the results high value. However, there are several points that need to be addressed before it can be considered for publication:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It needs a serious revision regarding grammar. It should be reviewed by an english speaker. 2. The conclusion includes points that were not evaluated by the researchers and makes assumptions based on these points. For example the phrase "The antimicrobial regimen isn't much more effective than the persuasive strategy in controlling antimicrobial use in the long-term" has no base, since in their questionnaire they did not evaluate antibiotic use nor they have access to the medical charts of their subjects to know if they received antibiotic prophylaxis or not. 3. In the discussion, the authors wrote "Regarding risk factors among patients and its relation with their knowledge about SSI, our results showed an insignificant relationship between smoking status and history of chronic illness with knowledge about SSI." The p value of chronic illness is statistically significant (only smoking is not). Also, to call it insignificant is misleading (it should be reported as non-statistically significant or not significant). If they were trying to state that the value was too close to 0.05 (0.07, for example), the mistake is an statistical one, since any value above 0.05 is not significant, regardless of the value or how close they are to 0.05. 	
Minor REVISION comments	Grammatical corrections.	
Optional/General comments	Try to limit conclusions and discussion to the subjects around the questions asked to the subjects. Anything else is supposition.	

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oswaldo Reyes
Department, University & Country	Saint Thomas Maternity Hospital, Panama