

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_100875
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Hepatitis D Virus among hepatitis B positive Blood Donors in Port Harcourt, Nigeria.
Type of the Article	Original research article -Cross sectional analytical study

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:

<https://www.journalibrr.com/index.php/IBRR/editorial-policy>

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. YES Study on prevalence of HDV among the HBsAg positive blood donors will increase the safety level of blood products, the screening process should therefore be extended to the HDV.</p> <p>2. YES The title of the article is appropriate for study design.</p> <p>3. YES. Abstract of the article is more comprehensive by following all the principles</p> <p>4. YES. Appropriately written</p> <p>5. YES. Well organised. Well written. Ample tables showed scientifically appropriate</p> <p>6. Sufficient and recent references are provided.</p> <p>A cross-sectional study design was most appropriate. Sampling technique and sample size was appropriately chosen. Tools and techniques were appropriate. Data analysis was done based on objectives. Followed ethical considerations. Well written manuscript</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>YES. Written in simple language. Easy to read and easy to understand. The article is very much suitable for scholarly communications.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	A.Padmaja
Department, University & Country	Sri Venkateswara Institute of Medical Sciences, India