

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Immunology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJI_102453
Title of the Manuscript:	SARS-CoV-2 SEROPREVALENCE IN HEALTHCARE WORKERS FROM THE THREE TEACHING HOSPITALS IN ABIDJAN (COTE D'IVOIRE) DURING PANDEMIC WAVES OF 2022
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:

(<https://www.journalaji.com/index.php/AJI/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.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes, this manuscript has the precise and clinical study and important for scientific community.</p> <p>Yes, it is suitable title.</p> <p>Yes, Comprehensive.</p> <p>Yes, this manuscript is appropriate level.</p> <p>Yes, correct.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>This is the different observation and clinical study for the community among SARS-CoV-2 infections (author explained the level of antibodies development against SARS-CoV-2 viral infections).</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>1. Yes, it is suitable for scholarly communications.</p> <p>2. Ref: 6, 7 were missed in the running manuscript.</p> <p>3. Author explained the table results below the tables which was format of thesis writing. As per journal format, kindly better to insert those table explanations to the result section of running manuscript, instead of below the tables.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Nil</p>	

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Magesh Sachidanandam
Department, University & Country	King Institute of Preventive Medicine and Research, India