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** *(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	A grammatical review of this paper is strongly suggested for authors to further improve the paper quality.	Some errors were seen and corrected.
Minor REVISION comments	**Line 6: rewrite this statement with better words selection** **Line9:** HCV; use full form when used first time and abbreviation in parenthesis () **Line 17:** number of questionnaire used please clarify??? **Line 11:** Aims are different than objectives. Need justification **Line 20**: please justify the age group as it contain 10 years as minimum level **Line 35**: sero prevalence should be added as key word **Line 48**: correction: geno type have shown differences **Line 63**: vertical transmission?/? **Line 88:** include ethical approval reference number **Line 94:** in order to obtain **Line 97:** 5ml blood **Line 99: INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION CRITERIA** **Line 107: data was subjected** **Line 113:** Age group 10- 20 years had the highest	The observations were noted and corrected.

	seroprevalence of 6.3% (n= 5), clarify/??? **Line 115:** The result showed ~~a~~ no significant **Line 120-122/145**: The sero-prevalence of HCV antibodies in relation to marital status shows that the singles had the highest seroprevalence of 5.3% followed by the married with 3.6%, while the least were recorded amongst the divorced and widowed who showed no detectable evidence of HCV antibodies (in this study classification of study participants needs clarification as seroprevalence has been investigated in pregnant women, then define the rationale of single/divorced/widow as part of study and their role like as control etc. At some points in text investigators mentioned the recruitment of pregnant women and in some tables like like 2 & 3 they have classified them in diversed group. So clarity throughout the manuscript is needed.....) **Line 181-190:** authors tried to justify the study results with literacy conditions but no good picture in result presentation has been found.... this point need more focused investigation by including various factors alongwith rate of education..... **Conclusion**: rewrite conclusion. Omit study results as they were discussed in discussion section in detail. A comprehensive conclusion along with necessary recommendation should be formulated.	All the observations were noted and some adjustments done.
Optional/General comments	Overall strength of paper for publication as original article is suitable. Novelty of work is well defined. Such studies in clinical domain have significant contribution.	