SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AJRID_43028**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Awareness about Hepatitis B and/or C Viruses among Residents of Adama and Asella Cities**
Type of the 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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments	**The manuscript seems scientifically robust and technically sound.** **Please address the following issues:** The authors need to state the country where the study was carried out from the topic after cities. The conclusive aspects in the abstract section did not capture major findings in your work. Please do so. **Keywords:** Add HBV, HCV, Residents, Adama, Asella and delete Logistic regression. **Introduction** Line 31 Citation needed. Line 36 Citation needed. Introduction not capturing the relevance of the topic. Please address the subject matter meticulously. Literature Review Line 47 Citation needed. Line 49 Citation needed. Line 59 Citation needed. Line 61 Citation needed. Line 73 Citation needed. Line 76 Citation needed. **Methodology** State the 2 groups divided and what criteria did you use for sampling. Line 251 State the package of SPSS used. **Results** Use Prevalence (%%) instead of Percent on all tables. Keys should be provided for Table 8 and 9 to define acronyms and abbreviations on the tables. Discussion is scanty and did not capture findings. Discussion should be done based on finding and sequentially as results are presented. Relate it to previous studies. Conclusion is too elaborate. Just mention key findings and recommend in few statements.	The literature review is removed from this manuscript since it is not needed. In table 8 and 9 we tried to remove the abbreviation so we don't need keys.
Minor REVISION comments	References should be based on Journal format. Recent references should be used. References are few and not proper for such study.	
Optional/General comments		

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20