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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential revisions

the sentence in the abstract: "Results of active and passive collection method are comparable" is not clear when compared with the results (active sampling is much more sensitive than passive sampling). It should be better expressed

when the Authors say "Since then, many Authors have underlined the importance of microbial surveillance of environmental matrix", it would be nice to better explain which is the correlation between quality of air and incidence of surgical site infections (or other health care related infections)

what does it mean: "This situation, in Italy, is typical of university hospitals"? maybe it is worth some expansion

In the conclusion: "Our study proved that the results of the active and passive sampling techniques are comparable", should be better phrased, as the two systems are not comparable in terms of sensitivity. Maybe better "active and passive sampling techniques correlate in a comparable way with the quality of air", or like

In the conclusion: "Therefore it seems difficult to develop a protocol for a unique standardized sampling method", should be better phrased in the sense that any standard protocol should take into account the different characteristics of the two techniques and each technique should be used according to the purpose of the air sampling.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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