



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_42575
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence and Health Workers' Perspective on Hepatitis B in Ngora District, Eastern 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>)



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	1. Second statement of result under abstract needs to be reviewed and also conclusion. 2. In the manuscript, total number of the study participants was not mentioned under result. The table 1 is not clear enough as it is not clear how you came about the calculation for the percentage. For instance; age bracket 15-20, you have 21 people with 23 percentage. How? Because the total number is not shown. I also believe that the total number for each of the demographic characteristic should be the same 1.e total for age should be same as marital status, same as cadre etc because you are distributing the same study population into different demographic characteristics. 3. Nursing and midwifery students were repeated twice with different numbers/percentage, why? 4. Figure1; prevalence of HBV. Laboratory data were reviewed between January to December 2016. What was the total number of the data reviewed? How did you get the percentage if the total is not known? 5. table 2. The number of different cadres presented here does not match the number presented in table 1. And moreso, radiographer was mentioned in table 2 but not in table 1. I think table 2 is not well presented if at all it is needed. 6. Figure 2: Showing level of knowledge of respondents according to qualification. Do you mean according to cadres? And I think table 2 and figure 2 represent the same information. Table 3; SHOULD BE Comparison of positive attitude (Yes response) BETWEEN DIFFERENT CADRES towards HBV	1. Statement of results under abstract has been reviewed. 2. Total number of study participant is now stated at the beginning of the table as 91 participants. percentages were calculated using the total number of participants as 91. The sum of the various parameters in table1 up to 91(Age, Cadre and qualification). 3. Nursing and midwifery students were both taken as a qualification and the cadre because the students have no cadre yet until they qualify. That is why it seems to appear twice. 4. During the mass testing between January and December a total of 52603 were tested from all the subcounties that make up Ngora district and this was used to estimate the prevalence by comparing it with 3939 that turned out positive from all subcounties. 5. Different cadres now march, the one radiograph did not fully participant in the study as he didn't complete his questionnaire. Therefore the authors have agreed to leave him out of this study 6. Figure 2 Cadres brings this out clearly though the qualification determines the cadre and level of knowledge. 7. Table 3 has be corrected to clearly bring out the meaning.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	I THINK THIS MANUSCRIPT NEEDS SERIOUS REVISION MOST EXPECIALLY THE RESULTS.	