



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<b><u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u></b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>2015_BJMMR_18578</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Prevalence of Anti-HBcore and HBsAg among health care workers in Public Hospitals, White Nile State, Sudan; 2013</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**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)
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>The study describes the serological profile of HBV infection among health care workers in a region in Sudan. As it is presented, <u>the manuscript does not provide relevant new information. Table 1 is confusing and should be omitted.</u> Authors can describe table 1 in the text. In contrast, information collected in the questionnaire should be described in a table or a graph. Equation to calculate simple size should be eliminated. Discussion is too short, likewise conclusions, they should be treated in more detail.</p> <p><b>Ethical issue:</b> <b>No ethical approval committee is mentioned in the manuscript.</b></p>	<p>We disagreed with the reviewer regarding: → The manuscript does not provide relevant new information. <b>It is the first survey to done in this area of Sudan.</b> → Table 1 is confusing and should be omitted. Authors can describe table 1 in the text. <b>This is main point in this survey; so, to solve the problem of confusion we divided it into TWO. It is the outcome of the information collected through the questionnaire.</b> → Equation to calculate simple size should be eliminated: <b>It is the basis for sample size determination. What is wrong about mentioning it?</b> → Discussion is too short, likewise conclusions: <b>They are to the point.</b> The rests of the comments were considered.</p>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	English grammar, spelling, and conventions should be revised: sometimes it is written anti HBs, then anti-HBs or anti-HB-core, then anti HBcore.	The comments here were considered.
<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments		