



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_43362
Title of the Manuscript:	SEROPREVALENCE OF SALMONELLA AGGLUTININS AMONG APPARENTLY HEALTHY STUDENTS OF A TERTIARY INSTITUTION IN NORTH-EASTERN NIGERIA.
Type of the 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>)

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 work demonstrated seroprevalence of <i>Salmonella</i> agglutinin in apparently healthy students of a tertiary institution in North East Nigeria. There is need to critically consider the following; Introduction: What are rationales for this study? Materials and Methods: Sample collection- lines 85-86; what sample specifically was used in the widal test? Serum or plasma? How was the sample obtained/prepared? Widal agglutination test- What immunoglobulin (Ig) was detected by the test kits? The interpretation of widal results based on degree of agglutination (and which is done visually) can be subjective and depends on the interpreter's sense of judgement/expertise as such, there is need to rule out interpretation bias. This can be ensured by engaging multiple, independent interpreters on the same samples. The reliability, sensitivity of widal test in detecting typhoidal salmonellosis are demonstrated to be poor (Ralte Lalremruata et al 2014, Andualem et al 2014, Mengist and Tilahun 2017), hence it cannot be definitive. What are inclusion/exclusion criteria for the recruitment of participants for the study? What controls (positive, negative) were set up for the assay? Ethical consideration- Why was informed consent verbal instead of written? There are conditions for verbal informed consent such as, illiteracy (un-lettered participant), incapacitation etc. How did the authors ensure that the elements of informed consent such as voluntariness, confidentiality, benefits, risk, and respect for persons were all taken care of?	The sample collected was specified (see line 85-87) Agglutination method does not detect types of immunoglobulin. Only the strip method detects chronic infection (IgG) or acute infection (IgM). Despite its draw back, it's of diagnostic important in many developing countries including Nigeria (Line 64-68) inclusion/exclusion criteria added Positive and Negative control from the kits was used It is only verbal informed consent sought. We will do that in our next research
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		