



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_27032
Title of the Manuscript:	Evidence of Hepatitis C Virus antibodies amongst pregnant women 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 <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	In the Abstract Part ,the authors have mentioned Objective, Aim, Materials and Methods, Result and Conclusion Separately But in my view ,in this abstract part the Author should make it as a one concise part and these subheadings is not needed in the Abstract. So it looks much better. Ethical Issues: There seem to be no ethical issues.	-This Journal accepts structured and non structured abstracts. Ethical consideration was stated in the work.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1.In the Discussion and Conclusion, results are restated. I would suggest change of approach, so that the restatement elaborates on the meaning of those numbers, rather than showing the numbers repeatedly. 2.I would suggest adding a sentence or two, pinpointing what approach, if any, can be undertaken by the health personnel to ensure delivery of better health care. If possible, this kind of a statement could prove helpful for policy makers to actually include HCV tests in routine investigations rather than just the statement of numbers as done currently. For example,... "Eventhough the fractions of illiterate and educated people suffering from HCV are different, the difference is not statistically significant. So, focusing on	It has been noted and corrected.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	treatment on the basis of literacy will not be fruitful. Rather, age groups should be the base criteria on which policies can be drafted on the basis of the numbers found in this study.” ... This is just a sample and is not to be used directly in the revision. 3. Reference typo: Ref 3 instead of 13. 1 is missing.	It has been corrected.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	It's a optional comment so its according to the Authors wish, the treatment strategy is not mentioned here so if mentioned it looks more perfect.	It has been mentioned as part of recommendation.