



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	<p>The study describes the serological profile of HBV infection among health care workers in a region in Sudan. As it is presented, the manuscript does not provide relevant new information. Table 1 is confusing and should be omitted. 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>Ethical issue: No ethical approval committee is mentioned in the manuscript.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> 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.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Henry Bautista-Amorocho
Department, University & Country	Health Sciences Department, University of Santander-UNDES, Colombia