



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
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>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 kostee 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>	



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.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sarwat Fatima
Department, University & Country	Deccan college of medical sciences, Hyderabad, Telangana, India