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	**This paper attempts to evaluate prevalence of the use of HBV using four different biomarkers. In as much as I applaud the author(s) for the objective, I have a lot of issues with the statistical aspect of the work.** **The statistical analysis of the data is not clear or virtually absent. Author(s) need to indicate how the data were analysed and the specific tools used.** **The use of t-test to study effect of one variable on the other is problematic and must be revised.** **Since sound discussion and conclusions are based on sound statistical analysis of data, my** **The specific comments have been made on the pdf version of the paper for the attention of the author(s).** **Ethical issue: No, ethical approval was sought.**	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Anonymous**
Department, University & Country	**University Of Cape Coast, Cape Coast, Ghana**