



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Pathogen Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_66841
Title of the Manuscript:	SEROPREVALENCE OF CYTOMEGALOVIRUS AMONG PAEDIATRIC PATIENTS WITH SEIZURE ATTENDING FEDERAL NEUROPSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL, KADUNA , NORTH WEST NIGERIA.
Type of the Article	Original Research 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/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



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 study has some useful findings and I congratulate the authors for the bold attempt in reporting them. There are, however, some important revisions to consider.</p> <p>Page 4, line 7: Showing the calculation of the sample size is not necessary. The authors could just indicate that they arrived at a sample size of 136 using the formula for sample size calculation in descriptive studies.</p> <p>Page 5, line 9: The description on the detection of CMV IgG is quite elaborate and does not contribute to the core aim of the study. I suggest this is simplified.</p> <p>Page 6, lines 16, 20 and 23 as well as fig 1 (page 9), fig 2 (page 10) and fig 3 (page 11) could easily be presented as a table showing the demographic data of CMV IgG positive patients. Please consider revising.</p> <p>Pages 9, 10 and 11: In all 3 figures, the frequencies reported in the pie charts do not add up to 100%. Rather, the total frequencies add up to 90%. I suppose this is the total number of samples screened. If the authors use percentages, then it should add up to 100%. Unfortunately, these figures have been used in the discussions (eg. Page 13, lines 16 and 17) and this is misleading. Please check and rectify these errors.</p> <p>Page 12, line 6: the prevalence of CMV IgG antibodies among children presenting with seizures is reported as 75.5% in this study. It will be useful if the prevalence of CMV IgG antibodies in the general population within the study area is stated and compared to the study group. Again, were there any control groups in this study? If so, what was the prevalence among the controls? Eg. What was the prevalence among children who presented with other conditions (not seizures) within the study period? If such data is not available, the authors can quote figures from other studies as they have done in page 12 paragraph 2. However, the populations considered in these other studies are entirely different from the present study. Please consider revising.</p> <p>Page 13, line 6: The statement "this shows a gradual increase in the prevalence between females and males" is difficult to understand. Please make the statement clearer or delete.</p> <p>Page 14, line 1: Unfortunately, this study has not shown that being positive for CMV IgG is associated with a higher prevalence of seizures in children. There were no control groups of say non-seizure patients. As such a conclusion that CMV is highly associated with seizures cannot be drawn from this study. The authors should please revise this. Also see abstract (page 1, line</p> <p>The entire manuscript is marred by many grammatical and typographical errors. A few examples have been listed below and shown in the reviewed manuscript with tracking.</p> <p>Page 1, line 5: seizures should replace seizure. This also applies to many parts of the manuscript.</p> <p>Page 1, line 13: Seizure is a presentation, not a diagnosis. See also page 3, line 8 and page 6, line 2.</p> <p>Page 1, line 23: in order to</p> <p>Page 2, line 13: delete comma</p> <p>Page 2, line 16: sensorineural is one word</p> <p>Page 4, line 6: were</p> <p>Page 5, line 2: parent, not patient</p> <p>Page 13, line 9: delete patient's</p> <p>Page 13, line 19: associated with</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Please check the following references for completeness</p> <p>Ref 4, 6 and 14: name of publisher, place of publication.</p> <p>Ref 18: should be "prenatal", not pregnatal.</p> <p>Ref 24: please add page numbers.</p> <p>Ref 31: same as ref 24</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Charles K. Hammond
Department, University & Country	University of Science and Technology, Ghana