**Referee’s report for:**

**SSI: A challenge in Obstetrics and Gynaecology Surgery**

**Title**  
The title of the manuscript does not quite describe the core message of the study.

**Originality**  
The study is a repetition of previously reported information/concepts.

**Abstract**While the abstract is concise, accurate and relevant, it is not formatted correctly and uses colloquial English.

**Keywords**  
The manuscript keywords are well-chosen, complete and would match MESH search terms.

**Introduction**  
The introduction outlines the background to the study, is concise, but poorly written with the use of colloquial English, poor English language syntax and numerous typographical errors. It is also poorly referenced with dated references and makes little effort at a convincing argument for the need for this study. However, it has clear study aims.

**Materials and Methods**The materials and methods are described in detail but appear inadequate. It is unclear whether the 50 “samples” reported in this paper were part of a larger sample of patients with SSI following a caesarean section and if so, how they were chosen or whether that was the total of SSI patients during the 3-month study period. Again, the narrative is in colloquial English with English language syntax and typographical errors. There is also a distinct lack of definitive articles such as “the” and “a” in some sentences.

**Ethical considerations**

There was neither a statement about the Institutional Ethics Review Board authorisation for this study nor about informed patient consent to participate in the study

**Statistical procedures**

These are mainly descriptive statistics and grossly inadequate. The authors should consult either a qualified statistician or employ appropriate statistical tests such as Chi-square test and Multivariate Logistic Regression Analysis in assessing the risk factors for post-caesarean section wound infection.

**Results**  
The results section consists mainly of tables and figures, with a significant number of acronyms that do not appear in full in other parts of the manuscript. The tables’ contents are not adequately described. What is CONS? What is DTA?, FD?1Breech?, F1?, APE? And BOH?. The authors should write out the full words of these acronyms the very first time they appear in the manuscript. The authors should also be more precise with their figures and avoid using phrases such as “about 50 developed SSI.“ While the results are plausible, they require proper statistical analyses to make them complete. The study does not appear to have realised its objective.

**Discussion**   
While the data appears to back up the discussion; the findings would be enhanced by proper statistical analyses which would then inform a critical discussion of the results relative to the findings of other published studies. The authors failed to recognise the strengths and limitations of their research and made no useful recommendations for further research on this topic.

**Conclusion:**

The conclusion section is imprecise and unjustifiable by the results of the study. It should be focussed and warranted by the results of the research. The WHO reference is not in the list of references.

**List of references**  
The list of references, while relevant, contains a significant number of dated publications. I append a list of more recent publications that the authors may consider using in their revised manuscript.adequate and appears complete.

**Writing style**  
Poor

**Tables & Figures**

The tables and figures are too many and filled with simplistic data; they need to contain useful data from the statistical analysis of the raw data. Did the authors mean to write “ Joel-Cohen” incision in table6?

**Overall evaluation**

**Manuscript –** Poor; has limited scientific merit

**Writing Style –** Poor.

**Recommendation –** I recommend a significant revision of this manuscript, taking into consideration my comments above.