

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 53446

Title: Mobile phones in the Orthopedic Operating Room: Microbial Colonization and Antimicrobial Resistance.

Reviewer's code: 02844631

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor, Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's country: Greece

Author's country: Pakistan

Manuscript submission date: 2019-12-20

Reviewer chosen by: Ruo-Yu Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-01-06 10:22

Reviewer performed review: 2020-01-27 16:32

Review time: 21 Days and 6 Hours

| SCIENTIFIC QUALITY | LANGUAGE QUALITY | CONCLUSION | PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS |
|--|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept | Peer-Review: |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language | (High priority) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept | <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of | (General priority) | Peer-reviewer's expertise on the |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not | language polishing | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision | topic of the manuscript: |
| publish | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision | <input type="checkbox"/> Advanced |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General |
| | | | <input type="checkbox"/> No expertise |
| | | | Conflicts-of-Interest: |
| | | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

General Comments: This is an interesting study on the microbial colonization of mobile phones in the orthopedic operating room, indicating that 93% of the phones were colonized by potentially pathogenic bacteria and suggesting measures for “Mobile hygiene” to avoid the risk of contamination and -potentially- of surgical site infections.

Specific Comments: 1. In the Results section, paragraph 3.2. Culture and Sensitivity, the authors must provide the percentage of mobile phones with multiple organisms. The same percentage must be added to Table 1 and Figure 2. 2. In the same paragraph 3.2. Culture and Sensitivity, the authors state that “Interestingly, there was 100% resistance to meropenem among the enterobacter and pseudomonas species and 54% resistance to oxacillin among coagulase negative staphylococcus species (Table 2)”. Does Table 2 contain the percentage of resistance or sensitivity? Also, according to Table 2 the respective percentage for meropenem and pseudomonas species was 80% and not 100%. 3. In the Results section, paragraph 3.4. Factors influencing colonization by Coagulase negative Staphylococcus, please change the word “orthopic” with “orthopedic”. 4. In the same paragraph 3.4. Factors influencing colonization by Coagulase negative Staphylococcus, please provide p-values. 5. In the Discussion section, 4th paragraph, I am not sure to what the authors refer with the sentence “Similarly, an incident in Larry Dossey’s “Distracted doctoring and the iPatient” narrates a nurse attending a phone call after washing her hands and forgets to clean them again before administering intravenous antibiotics to her patient”. 6. In the Discussion section, 5th paragraph, please change the word “esistant” with the word “resistant”. 7. Please consider decreasing the length of the discussion and avoid repetitions. 8. In Table 1, first row: Coagulase negative Staphylococcus, the numbers and percentages are probably wrong as their addition exceeds the n=62 and the 100%. 9. In Table 1, the authors must provide



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

the percentage of mobile phones with multiple organisms. 10. Is the title of Table 2: "Antibiotic sensitivity analysis" correct or is it an antibiotic resistance analysis? 11. In Figure 2 please add the number of mobile phones with multiple organisms. 12. In Figure 3 please add the species.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No