

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

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.journalibr.com/index.php/IBRR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>YES</p> <p>YES</p> <p>ABSTRACT NEEDS TO BE REVISED, ADD PERTINENT INFORMATIONS AND MAKE IS FACE OF WHOLE MANUSCRIPT.</p> <p>YES –</p> <p>YES</p> <p>OMIT OR DELETE REFERENCES MORE THAN 10 YEAR OLD UNTIL THEY ARE OF HISTORIC SIGNIFICANCE OR VERY IMPORTANT SCIENTIFICLLY</p> <p>PHARASE OBJECTIVE PROPERLY, SCIENTIFICALLY, MAKE IT MEANINGFUL</p> <p>ADD KEY WORDS AT LEAST 6 AND PER OBJECTIVE, METHODOLOGY AND MeSH</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Revise introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write in order i.e. introduction of your topic, brief historical back ground , epidemiology if applicable, then • Explain your hypothesis properly and in scientific way • Give proper rationale/justification of conducting this study in a scientific way that why you are conducted this study • Give implications of this study on present knowledge and practice in our set up and how this will affect the existing knowledge and skills/practice • Give relevant latest literature review on topic and objective very briefly • Omit / delete all known or common facts already known. • Give information's as per objective domain. • Delete all information's out of scope of objective • Construct sentence in continuity and meaning full • Add objective at the end of introduction <p>REVISE METHODOLOGY PROPERLY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give full name of department, institution where this study was conducted • Give proper study design and should be same in abstract and methodology • Give exact duration of study (DD/MM/YY) • Add inclusion/exclusion criteria precisely • Give methodology precisely , briefly with all important details and delete unnecessary steps , in order • Which data or variables collected as per objective and how = give precise details • How data was collected? • Who collected the data? • How Bias in data collection were addressed • Which statistical analysis is done and on which variables? 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>REVISE DISCUSSION</p> <p>This is the weakest part of manuscript whereas the discussion is the main body of a research paper in which all results discussed/ compared/ with reasoning and rationale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not written with proper reasoning , rational and in scientific way without come directed towards conclusion drawn • Discuss each variable/parameter in separate paragraph, Start by giving info that which variable is going to be discussed, then Compare your results with literature, give reasons/justification in a scientific way if they varies Then give outcome of that discussion in last sentence of that para. • Similarly discuss all variables separately • Write within domain of objective • Omit/delete all other discussion beyond scope of objective • Construct proper sentences with continuity and should be meaning full. • Make discussion directed towards conclusion <p>CONCLUSION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not written properly – revise • Give conclusion briefly and to the point based on results not on authors idea or book knowledge • It should be in consistence with the objective/methodology • Avoid using your own ideas or recommendations in conclusion 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delete omit all known, common facts and details beyond the scope of objective • Delete /omit all repetitions • Be precise, to the point - no unnecessary details • Sentences should be coherent, containing precise details and well-constructed • Check for Grammar at places • Objective , study design and conclusion should be exactly same every-where in manuscript • Don't use one or two sentence paragraph, express one idea in one para without come in last sentence of that para • Give conclusion based on your results- not your own ideas or recommendations 	

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><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Ishtiaq Ahmed</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>AI-Nafees Medical College, Isra University, Pakistan</p>