



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Few grammatical errors in abstract like line 6 Health care workers at high risk. Something is missing Line 11 pretested structures questionnaire.</p> <p>Further a copy of the questionnaire must be attached to know whether the questions regarding history of exposure to known positive cases was included and further what sort of exposure was it. Question on HCW's Vaccination status was included or not. As it is essential for a study like this.</p> <p>As the prevalence of the anti HB core sited is 60% which is very high . In methodology - samples were tested by elisa nothing else has been mentioned about the sensitivity and specificity of the test procedure and manufacturer details.</p> <p>Result - must include the seropositivity for AntiHBcore and HBsAg based on the the various demographic factors like localities studied kotee and algeteeena etc gender , education level and marital status of the individuals in order to conclude where the prevalence is high and in which group of HCW's .</p> <p>Conclusion - is better to comment based on the data gathered at what level the preventive measure has to be adopted to reduce such high prevalence of Anti</p>	<p>We disagreed with the reviewer regarding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. History of exposure to known positive cases was included and further what sort of exposure was it. 2. Vaccination status was included or not: <p>The manuscript is about prevalence of Anti-HBcore and HBsAg.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. So, there is no need to talk about past history. This will be in a separate manuscript. 2. We did not test the sera for Anti-HBsAg (HBsAg – Antibody). Accordingly there is no need to incorporate vaccination status. <p>Regarding our comment: it was based on our findings and the suggested levels were both community and institutional levels</p> <p>The rest of points were considered and the required correction was done.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	HBcore and HBsAg in HCW's so that the target strategies can be prioritized.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Well. No major errors as it is a simple study done on data base. Only thing is the outcome of that data base has to be properly communicated to the HCW's and readers of the article.	