

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Microbiology</a>
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

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>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.</b>	Yes, the manuscript is important for the scientific community as it is an ERA of emerging new strains of viruses which can threaten human lives like HIV, HBV, HCV, & SARS etc. The already emerged viruses can also mutate and may affect the HealthCare System so similar types of studies will help in keeping Health Care System prepared to combat any emergency situation.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes, the title of the article is suitable. It is clear, concise, and informative. It accurately reflects the content of the paper.	
<b>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.</b>	Yes, the abstract of the article is comprehensive. It provides a good overview of the research question, methodology, results, and implications of the study. The abstract is also well-written and easy to read.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate. The manuscript is well organized and easy to follow. The subsections are logical and informative.	
<b>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.</b>	Yes, I think the manuscript is scientifically correct. The methodology is sound, and the results are presented in a clear and concise manner. The authors also discuss the limitations of their study and suggest directions for future research. Reaction of immune system to any antigen including different viruses varies between individuals in same community. There is definite possibility that the immune reaction can be different in communities even. In view that emerging new viruses and mutations of existing viruses e.g. Shift and Drift phenomenon in case of Influenza virus can pose threat of Pandemics so manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.-</b>	Yes, the references are sufficient, but the references are not the latest. Authors can update the references; with some new references, there are various relevant sources, including recent papers or on the web network.	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, the language/English quality of the article is suitable for scholarly communications.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### PART 2:

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

#### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Sanjay Kumar Sharma</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>UNS ASMC, India</b>