



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_47582
Title of the Manuscript:	Surveillance of Hepatitis B biomarkers in Borno state, 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>)

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the duration of the study. 2. How did you calculate the sample size of the study? 3. How did you select the patient population for the study? 4. Is there any confirmatory test you performed for validation of your results? 5. Which molecular technique you used for detection of the genome of the HBV, kindly mention in methods. 6. How did you calculate the susceptibility rate, kindly mention in methods? 7. You mentioned four objectives of the study in introduction, while results for only three, why? 8. Out of 410 total sample population, 150 were blood donors, and 50 were pregnant women, who were the rest of the sample population? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sept 2017- September 2018 2. The sample size for the research was determined using the formula: $n = \frac{Z^2 Pq}{L^2}$ prevalence of 8.79% was used. 3. Randomly until desired number was achieved. Any patient who consented 4. Same as No. 5 5. } PCR technique. Details not for this paper. 6. (No. -ve for all biomarkers/Total sample) X 100 7. The result of the fourth objective is for another paper 8. Traders(50), Farmers(73), Civil servants(20) and students(67), blood donors(150), pregnant women(50)= 410
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In method the details about city is not relevant for the study, kindly remove this. 	The authors consider it relevant to show the various towns covered.
Optional/General comments	The concept of the study is good but methodology part is not explained well.	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	