



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| 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 Article: | Original research paper |

PART 2:

| FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any) | Authors' response to final evaluator's comments |
|---|---|
| <p>The manuscript was aimed to investigate prevalence of HBsAg on pregnant women in a city from Nigeria. Despite the information is very valuable to public health programmes in Nigeria, the manuscript remains with typo, and missing informations which authors could make efforts to improve the study and to have consistent results to be meaningful to hepatitis B prevention and control in pregnant women. It is worth to note that info is not only important to Delta state, but for other African regions. Then, some points are raised below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Abstract: Study population number for non-pregnant women was 50 in abstract and methods, therefore, in results, authors changed the number size to 100 non-pregnant women (table I), which make me have serious doubts about the findings presented here. It's very suspicious. 2- Methods: Authors related that population study number sized cannot be increase, which is very pity, and at same time, very suspicious since blood collection were performed within only 21 days. 3- Methods: Adding, ELISA kit used by authors are rapid tests, and they did not inform a reference number of the kit, which is relevant. This info is very important to the readers to reproduce the same assay to get HBsAg results in other regions. 4- Methods: Also, I cannot understand if they repeated samples with undetermined results, which undefined results can commonly occur using rapid tests. 5- Methods: Registration number of IRB still missing without an explanation. 6- Results: I cannot understand the sentence between line 151 and 153. Some information is missing, since authors end the sentence with “,”, there is no sense this paragraph. 7- Results: Table II – Sample information is very confuse. It shows that age sampled among 20 and 34 y/o for pregnant women had 90/100 (90%) subjects, meanwhile in non-pregnant group, the same age group had 50/100 (50%) subjects. Adding, women with 15-19 y/o in non-pregnant group has 10-fold more subjects than on pregnant group; this information cannot be compared, as performed in figure 1. 8- Figure 2 is very informative, but sentence in line 232-233 has no relation with HBsAg results. Authors should think about an explanation to pregnant women went to the clinic to perform screening tests only at third trimester. This information could be more discussed. 9- Authors recommended health programmes in rural communities, but the info about whether study population were from urban or rural areas was also missing in the manuscript. 10- Unfortunately, the conclusion reported on lines 245-248 may not be meaningful for the manuscript, since number of subjects are too small. I would not include that. <p>If there is few information about HBsAg prevalence in pregnant women in Nigeria, the data is still interesting for future health programmes targeting HBV prevention and control guidelines during delivery. Therefore, authors should carefully improve information to the readers to have more concise data to future breakthroughs for prevention and control infectious diseases, as hepatitis B.</p> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Name: | <i>Juliana G. Melgaço</i> |
| Department, University & Country | <i>Fundação Oswaldo Cruz, Brazil</i> |