



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Gastroenterology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRGA_43143
Title of the Manuscript:	Serological Screening of HBV and HCV Among Patients with Suspected Liver Diseases Seen at A Tertiary Hospital in Bauchi, 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>)

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	<p>How about "Retrospective analysis of HBV and HCV Serological Screening of Suspected Liver Diseases Patients Seen at A Tertiary Hospital in Bauchi, Nigeria" for your title.</p> <p>My understanding is that you analysed previous laboratory records to gather your data for this study. Your title gives the impression that you conducted a laboratory assay for this study If my understanding is right, then your sentence "The Rapid diagnostic latex kits (Biotest Hamgzhou (Biotech CO Ltd China) kit) for sero detection of HBsAg and anti- HCV was used, and analysis carried out according to manufacturer instruction" does not belong to your methodology.</p>	<p>Both titles can be accepted, as it is retrospective study On methodology used, the rapid diagnostic latex kit is the kit routinely used in the lab for sero detection, which we mentioned in the text</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Ethical issues</p> <p>There is no indication that Human research ethical clearance was obtained for this study.</p>	<p>Yes, this is secondary data and retrospective study. Nevertheless, it was an oversight on our part. The correction has been effected</p>
Optional/General comments		