

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Microbiology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMB_125851
Title of the Manuscript:	Hepatitis B Virus Prevalence and Genotype Distribution in Human Immunodeficiency Virus Infected Patients from Brazzaville, Republic of the Congo
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1-reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1-reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The authors evaluated a significant number of real patients and managed a lot of data with significant expensive procedures. Patients living with HIV are more exposed to chronic infections than other immuno-depressed patients. The article shortly analysed all available data and places results in a very useful phylogenetic tree.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	yes	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is comprehensive	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	yes	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	Materials & methods are very well presented. • Results & discussion 1. Data are robust. 2. Authors provided relevant references during discussion. 3. Discussion and conclusions are supported by facts and figures. 4. Appropriate statistical analyses has been carried out • Conclusions are not biased	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	I would prefer to see more references from the last 5 years	
Minor REVISION comments	yes	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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:	Calarasu Cristina
Department, University & Country	University of Medicine and Pharmacy of Craiova, Romania