



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	2015_BJMMR_18578
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Anti-HBcore and HBsAg among health care workers in Public Hospitals, White Nile State, Sudan; 2013
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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve the language and format throughout the paper 2. Line 49-50. Can the authors define HBV infection and carrier states? 3. Line 75: What is the pre-tested structured questionnaire? Can the authors give more information about it? 4. Have the authors done analyses to determine the risk factors for HBV infection in the HCW population? 5. Discussion: Can the authors discuss in more depth? For example, what is the prevalence among general population? How the study compare to other studies? What are the limitations of the study? 	<p>We disagreed with the reviewer regarding:</p> <p>4. Have the authors done analyses to determine the risk factors for HBV infection in the HCW population?</p> <p>Our manuscript is dealing with quantifying i.e, prevalence of Hepatitis B virus. So, there is no need to talk about the risk factors here.</p> <p>5. Discussion: Can the authors discuss in more depth? For example, what is the prevalence among general population? How the study compare to other studies? What are the limitations of the study?</p> <p>We referred to the general population and we compared to other studies. It was to the point. The rests of the comments were considered.</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Figure 1 is nowhere referred to in the paper. It is not a results 2. Reformat table 1 3. It will be better if there is a table describing sample characteristics 	The comment regarding Table 1 was considered.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		