



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International STD Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_I-SRR_29846
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge and attitude of health care workers towards Hepatitis B infection and vaccination in a Federal Teaching Hospital in South Western 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	<p>The paper reported the knowledge, attitude, prevention practice towards HBV among healthcare workers. The compulsory comments are as followings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The paper needs to be better written. There are lots of confusing paragraphs, sentences, and typos throughout the paper. The paper also needs to be better organised given the large amount of information and findings from the study. 2. The abstract stated that the study used a simple random sampling technique to determine the sample size. However, the paper did not state how the sample are chosen and how the sample size are determined. Note, a simple random sampling technique is not something used to determine the sample size. The authors need to carefully state about methods of sampling, and how they determine the sample size. Other issues like how they conducted the survey, and what is the response rate also needs to be reported. 3. The authors described health belief model as the theoretical framework. In line 68 to 88, the authors introduced how the theory applied to the study. However it is confusing what the authors tried to state and achieve in the study. For example, it is unclear to me whether line73-88 are 	<p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>They were assumptions with reference to the theory but some part has been re-written</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>hypotheses or assumption. If they were hypotheses, the study did not seem to test them; if they are assumptions, I do not see the need for them. The authors should consider rewriting the part.</p> <p>4. There are a lot of findings from the survey. It will be very helpful if the authors can organize the findings according to knowledge, attitude, prevention practice.</p> <p>5. The conclusion from line 233-235 is not well supported by the findings, especially when inline 278-279, the authors stated that 'though both the knowledge of HB vaccine and its uptake among them was very low'. Do the authors not consider knowledge about HBV vaccine as knowledge towards HBV? This brings the next question, what is considered to be knowledge, what is attitude, what is practice? The authors should state them more clearly.</p> <p>6. Line 233-283 needs to be rewritten. It is very confusing.</p> <p>7. The authors should rewrite the conclusion and recommendation accordingly. The recommendations should be based on the findings and discussions</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Done</p>
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Line 13-16 in introduction is confusing and not accurate2. Line 150: 'after exposure to hepatitis B vaccine', is it meant to exposure to hepatitis B virus?3. Line 162 'also all respondents (87.1%)'. It is not all respondents4. Line 170-176, 182-184, 215-216 are confusing, please rewrite5. Line 272. Where the number 65.7% come from?	Corrected Corrected Corrected Done Corrected
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		