



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2015_BMRJ_18201
Title of the Manuscript:	MATERNAL SEROPREVALENCE OF HEPATITIS B VIRUS SEROLOGIC MARKERS AMONG ATTENDEES OF A SECONDARY HEALTH FACILITY IN MAIDUGURI, NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Short 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	It is not indicated if the paper had been published before. Permission by all authors is not indicated. Also it is not indicated if the material submitted infringes on existing copyright, replicates a previous study or if authors have agreed to the paper content. No unethical practice is suspected. English quality is clear, correct and unambiguous. Abstract does not correlate well with the guidelines: purpose, study design, place and duration were not stated. Introduction gives factual information. No figure is used. Manuscript is sufficiently robust and technically sound. It is accepted. Materials and methods: Method is suitable and technically standard. Sufficient details of the method are provided. Result and Discussion: Data are well controlled and robust. Authors provide relevant and current references during discussion. However, each table should be under its discussion, not packed together. Discussion and conclusion are based on actual facts and figures. Statistical analyses are a must; sufficient and appropriate statistical analyses are carried out. Conclusion is supported by data – 8.79% prevalence rate – not biased but based on data discussed inside manuscript. No acknowledgement. No competing interest declared.	No All authors have agreed to publish. As above



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Authors' contributions are not stated. Consent is presented. Ethical approval is also presented. Cited references are relevant and adequate, and indicated by the reference numbers in the brackets during the discussion. However, since the paper is on seroprevalence, the total number of the research participants who were positive(52.9%) to the four serological markers should have been emphasized, not only the 47.3% that were susceptible.	Included Stated We decided to highlight those at high risk
--	---	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Virus (line 8), rate (line 17), Maiduguri and Nigeria (line 21), antibodies (line 52), from (line 92), 2nd % (line 116), full stop (line 137), 's' in years (line 150), 's' in predisposes (line 177), 'ly' in positively (line 181) can be deleted. 'B' after 'hepatitis' (line 25), 'r' after 'manufacture' (line 89), 'and 52.7% tested positive.' after 'negative' (line 102), 'the' after 'of' (line 106), 's' after 'person' (line 122) can be added. 'Thirteen' can be changed to 'fourteen' (line 118) based on the given data and the statement can be reframed for clarity.	All noted No. It should remain 13
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Results of those with tribal marks should have been analysed as this can be a means of hepatitis B virus (HBV) transmission due to unsterilized materials used. Health education against transmission of HBV through sharing of sharps, as tribal mark was one of the items in the bio data, should also be recommended.	Noted