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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsary Revisions
1. PPX-UV-Device (page 4): there is no explanation if the patients can stay in the room during the disinfection procedure
2. Methods (page 6): the description of the standard manual cleaning with Dispatch is not sufficient. Concentration, contact time and information of wipe materials (single use?) is missing.
3. Methods (page 6): PPX-UV - the description how to clean visibly soiled surfaces by hand is not accurate enough
4. Measures and Analysis (page 7): The failure of the authors to implement a photoreactivation of PPX-UV irradiated samples.
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In this position one of my tasks is to test chemical disinfectants for surface disinfection in hospitals and other areas. In this context the PPX-UV disinfection could seen as a competitor. But I reviewed this article as an independent scientist from the university of Bonn, Germany.