



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BMRJ_26530
Title of the Manuscript:	Seroprevalence of Hepatitis C Virus amongst blood donors in parts of North Central Nigeria
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	1. After reference 2 – choo et al needs to be removed 2. Introduction is too big, part can be shifted to discussion as necessary 3. Results – first sentence percentage of 7% is inadequate, better to go to next decimals. Avoid rounding off. 7% looks like only 700 cases 4. Age group of donors allowed for blood donation has not been mentioned anywhere. Different countries have different values. As there are donors of 16 or above 60, details would be necessary 5. In consent form, pregnant women informed consent is taken. Donors are usually non pregnant and there is no mention of any donors being pregnant in text. 6. Do check the references again. Some are missing volume nos. Like 19, have a detailed look and maintain a standard format across all references. 7. Results in abstract – only important data can be used. 0.00 is not really necessary.	-It has been deleted. -Two paragraphs were deleted to reduce the length. - It was written as 7.0% in the original document earlier sent. -It was mentioned under inclusion/exclusion criteria. We have added information on the age values for blood donors in the text. -The pregnant women where not part of the donors. The Ethical Clearance for the entire study was for HCV in blood donors and pregnant women. -The references were revised to conform to the author's instruction. -It has been effected.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		