



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRIMPS_44714
Title of the Manuscript:	Hepatitis B in Pregnancy: Knowledge, Access to Screening and Vaccination in a Low-Resource Setting, Cameroon.
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>)

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 presentation of the results and discussion made the reading and reviewing boring as the authors kept talking about the same thing in different ways.	Dear Reviewer, we appreciate your comments. However, permit me to make a few observations. When we compared your comments with those of the other reviewers (THREE REVIEWERS!!) we were lost! At one point we wondered whether it was the same manuscript that was being reviewed. We agree that in a milieu where the standard of health care is high, the information provided might seem boring but this is of great importance in most sub Saharan settings as this is likely to influence the standard of care. (Hepatitis and Pregnancy)
Minor REVISION comments	The tables are clumsy and should be made simpler and clearer. The tools used in the method section do not appear sufficient to make many of thee general statements made. The conclusion is also `not there`.	- 'The tables are clumsy and should be made simpler and clearer'.(no comment) -Furthermore, we found it difficult to clarify most of your concerns. For example, you stated 'The conclusion is also `not there`, when we have this as conclusion (lines 249-254).
Optional/General comments		Dear Reviewer, while respecting your opinion, we are convinced that the Editor in Chief will take a decision which will endorse the fact that the manuscript contains valuable information and respects the norms of scientific publications.

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	