



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJR2H_46713
Title of the Manuscript:	SEROPREVALENCE OF HEPATITIS B SURFACE ANTIGEN IN PREGNANT WOMEN OF GENERAL HOSPITAL AGBOR, DELTA STATE
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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 was aimed to investigate prevalence of HBsAg on pregnant women in a city from Nigeria. Regard to few information about HBV disease on pregnant women from Africa, the manuscript is important to public health programmes in Nigeria. Therefore, there are some corrections that should be performed along the manuscript to be more informative and helpful for physicians and scientists in this area of interest. To make this possible some recommendations are described below:</p> <p>1- English language is hard to follow and sometimes is so unusual in medical terms. It should be revised.</p> <p>2- Introduction: Information about treatment and vaccination guidelines or any recommendations by Nigeria's Ministry of Health is missing. It will be very helpful for readers if authors could include some info about it.</p> <p>3- Methods: There is no specification about the period of blood collection on study population, even about a number registration in IRB approving the study.</p> <p>4- Methods: There is no information if the immunoassay used was a commercial kit or it was performed by in-house method. It is very important to clarify that for readers.</p> <p>5- Results: I cannot understand if the legend on tables and figures were the description of results. It will be better to explain the results founded if authors rewrite the results and legends.</p> <p>6- Discussion: It is very poor of explanation of the results. Authors cannot explain their findings, mainly when they showed correlation between age and HBsAg prevalence. Even more regard to sample size, which is too small to separate by age the study population. In my opinion, this part of the results was failed, there is no statistical power. They should looking for more samples to the results be powerful and meaning.</p> <p>7- Conclusion: Because of sample size, the findings do not support conclusion made by authors, mainly considering age of pregnant women.</p>	<p>Most raised points (other than increased sample size) were corrected as suggested. Work has already been done. Couldn't have increased sample size at this point. We recommended more sophisticated approach to the study with higher sample size as such.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript is interesting to Africa public health, but should be carefully revised and resubmitted after all corrections performed.</p>	<p>Thank you.</p>
Optional/General comments		

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>There is no information about a registration number in IRB. It should be included.</p>	