



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>Asian Journal of Medicine and Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_33128
Title of the Manuscript:	SEROPREVALENCE OF HIV, HBV and HCV AMONG PRISONERS IN SOKOTO, NIGERIA
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A sample size of 100 looks too small to make out any deductive statistical inference. ▪ Author should indicate how sample size was calculated, based on a previous prevalence in the Country, to justify the 100 inmates sampled. ▪ The Author set out to test 100 inmates but yet tested 99 and no information was given for not testing 1 inmate sample. ▪ Three months seems a short period for a prospective study. At least 6months would suffice. ▪ No evidence of ethical clearance for the study was provided. <p>No evidence that Author did obtain either verbal or written consent from each of the prisoners sampled. It is not enough to only work with the Medical Unit of the Prison without seeking informed consent of the inmates.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A sample size of 100 does not look small considering the prison population we met on ground ▪ The sample size calculation is already indicated in the main work as suggested. And we used the prevalence of 7% got from the prison in Jos, Plateau state Nigeria (28) ▪ We set out to test 100 inmates but at course of the study we couldn't get 100 inmates but 99. Sorry for the mix-up but we were left with the reality on ground ▪ The three months stated here was the period of collection of sample and analysis and it was faster because compliance of from prison authorities and prisoners excluding time for design, proposal defence , source of kit and so on ▪ Evidence of ethical clearance has been attached to the last page of the manuscript which indicated the approval of prison authority for the subject matter which you can verify ▪ Written informed consent was obtained. It was an oversight but has been included in the main work.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		Thank very much