



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_40254
Title of the Manuscript:	Human immunodeficiency virus and hepatitis B virus co-infection: a cross-sectional household survey in Kiruhura district, southwestern, Uganda.
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>)

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Auhors need to explain why they did not yield information about the isolated prevalence of HBsAg, anti-HBc and anti-HIV. This information is very important and it should not be omitted from the manuscript. Authors expressed a confused concept of acute and chronic HBV infection in Abstract (row #14), Discussion (row #318) and Conclusion (row #328): HBsAg would mean acute infection and anti-HBc meaning chronic infection. The correct concept appears in Methods section (row # 142-5). It is important to know why the authors did not provide the results of HBsAg, anti-HBc and anti-HIV isolated prevalence. It is possible that authors omitted this information because they were submitted to other periodic concomitantly. Is there part of a "split publication"? However, this doubt will vanish when the authors agree in yield these data.	The information on prevalence of viral monoinfections of HIV, HBsAg and HBcAb were 6.6% (CI; 5.5-7.8), 4.1% (CI; 3.3-5.1) and 31.5% (CI; 29.7-33.9) respectively in the whole study population. These results have been presented in a narrative form in the abstract and result sections of the manuscript. The markers of HBsAg were used to determine the prevalence of current/recent HBV infection meanwhile the serological markers of anti-HBc were used to establish the lifelong infection in this study. All the relevant changes were made in the various sections row #14 in the abstract , row #318 in the discussion, and row #328 in the conclusion See the reply above.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The section "Introduction" is extremely large. Most of the text may and should be supressed.	We have expunged most of the text in the introduction and have suppressed the information that is necessary for the paper
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	To perform this study was very laborious and its protocol deserves congratulations. It is not easy to perform a well-conduct survey with judicious methodology.	