



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_48296
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE OF HEPATITIS B AMONGST ASYMPTOMATIC PERSONS VISITING BRAITHWAIT MEMORIAL SPECIALIST HOSPITAL (BMSH), NIGERIA
Type of the 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 (MAJOR) REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The title of the paper could be more specific: As prevalence of HBV infection is being determined, it may be more appropriate to 'NOT' mention the word 'asymptomatic' as 'old' persons with HBV infection include persons with both acute and chronic infection and most likely symptomatic if they have past (old) infection. A specific mention of asymptomatic can raise the issue of selection bias. The author could include in the title 'general knowledge of HBV among HBV positives' as a significant amount of useful data on general knowledge of HBV among HBVs' was included in the 'discussion' section. As prevalence rates vary among different populations/location within a state in Nigeria, the title could have included the exact location of study. 2. It would have been useful if more data was presented in tables/diagrams regarding demographic (including tribe) and general knowledge of HBV among HBV positives. That would have helped data interpretation among HBV positives. Interestingly, a significant amount of data interpretation of HBVs was included in the discussion section of the paper which would have been easier to interpret if the data was presented as tables/diagrams. 	<p>We have corrected the manuscript for upgradation</p> <p>Correction made</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Author should revise the last statement in the abstract of the paper for it to be line with the recommendations listed at the end of the paper. The reason stated in the last line of the abstract for the high prevalence of HBV in the study was not specific and there was no significant evidence from the results of the study to support it. Moreover, 73% of the respondents in the study had HBV vaccination in the past and were negative to HBsAg indicating significant prevention efforts for HBV at the location. • Sample size calculation: referring to other papers and method of sample size estimation is recommended. A single population proportion formula by assuming lowest prevalence of HBV and highest prevalence would be more appropriate as used in this example (evidenced in Kirbak et al,2017)(Pan African Medical Journal: 26(72). Accessed: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5398872/ . • Technical clarifications are needed: The author including the specificity and sensitivity of the HBsAg test could help estimate the validity of the results of the study. Confirmation test (by ELISA) if done, needs to be stated. • Data presentation: Table format could include % in brackets next to actual numbers. In addition, data on socio demographic variables and general knowledge among HBV positives could be displayed as tables. • References as recommended in the journals guideline for articles was not followed by the author. Numbering within the content and subsequent listing at the end of the article needs to be done. 	All corrections done
Optional/General comments	While the study appears to be sound, ethical concerns could be raised as explained below. The author also needs to conduct significant editing of language (especially in grammar and phrasing) so that the language is clear, correct and unambiguous.	

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> <p>Yes. From the data in the bar charts regarding asymptomatic males and females, a significant number of respondents were between the ages of 10-20 years. In Nigeria, the age at which a child is longer a minor is 18 years. Hence 'informed consent' needs to be obtained from the parents for any respondent less than 18 years. A 'voluntary' involvement as selection of respondents may pose significant ethical issues.</p>	