



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE &Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_55900
Title of the Manuscript:	CROSS SECTIONAL STUDY OF HEPATITIS B SURFACE ANTIGEN (HBsAg) INFECTION AMONG ASYMPTOMATIC HOSPITAL ATTENDEES
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	<p>The manuscript describes the epidemiological impact of HBsAg positivity in a region of Nigeria, and compares it with other similar situations in the same country.</p> <p>However, the drafting of the article does not appear linear and is sometimes repetitive. The text should therefore be reviewed.</p> <p>Despite having been consecutively enrolled, why are women more than double than men? (liver disease? pregnancy? other?)</p> <p>What is the infection status of the different positive HBsAg subjects: inactive carriers? Chronic hepatitis? Cirrhotic? Their diagnostic definition is also useful in relation to the rather advanced age of this group of patients.</p> <p>While stressing that the male component, although with different percentages, is more involved in the HBsAg positivity, it would be useful to know why in Tula's work (reference 13) it is stated that there is no significant difference between the two sexes. Therefore, it would be appropriate to clarify the concept, otherwise it should not be mentioned because in the next paragraph it creates confusion.</p> <p>Since sometimes remarkably different rates of HBsAg positivity are described in the various studies about Nigeria, specify what the causes of the different epidemiological patterns may be.</p>	<p>The entire manuscript has been revised as advised</p> <p>The discussion session has been revised accordingly</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>I would speak of HBV positive HBsAg infection rather than HBsAg infection.</p> <p>When we talk about "persistent hepatitis" it is a form of chronic active or really persistent hepatitis</p> <p>In the discussion, the paragraph referring to Hall represents a repetition of what has already been said in the introduction</p> <p>The fifth paragraph of the discussion is pleonastic</p> <p>Specify better the meaning of the first sentence of the sixth paragraph (Arwa)</p>	<p>The paragraph referring to Hall has been expunged</p> <p>The said (fifth) paragraph has also been removed</p> <p>The sentence has been revised</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>It would have been useful to know some details on the hepatitis B vaccination coverage in Nigeria, in consideration of the hint that is made of it in the conclusions.</p>	<p>The conclusion has been revised.</p>

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	