

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Microbiology Research Journal International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_MRJI_113386
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of non-response to hepatitis B vaccines in individuals over 15 years in the Centre Region of Cameroon: a cross-sectional study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>MAKE MORE COMPREHENSIVE, SHOULD CONTAIN ALL IMPORTANT DETAILS</p> <p>OK YES- NEEDS FEW CHANGES AS SUGGESTED BELOW</p> <p>YES</p> <p>INTRUDUCTION:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write in order i.e. introduction of your topic, brief historical background, and epidemiology if applicable, then • Explain your hypothesis properly and in a scientific way. • Give proper rationale/justification for conducting this study in a scientific way that why you have 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 the topic and objective very briefly. • Omit/delete all known or common facts already known. • Give pieces of information as per the objective domain. • Delete all information out of the scope of the objective. <p>RESULTS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Start with the total number of subjects. • Present data as per objective, and delete all unnecessary data beyond the objective domain. Lot of demographic and unnecessary data is added beyond scope of objective. Delete all. • Tables are not labelled properly – they should give information on which data is presented. • Give n value in each table label. • Give data in both n and % or statistical value • Give results of each table separately in separate para in order with imp results in both % and n value or statistical values • Present data as per objective, delete unnecessary data <p>DISCUSSION:</p> <p>This is the weakest part of the manuscript whereas the discussion is the main body of a research paper in which all results are discussed/ compared/ with reasoning and rationale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not written with proper reasoning, rational and in a scientific way without outcome directed towards conclusion drawn • Discuss each variable/parameter in a separate paragraph, Start by giving info about which variable is going to be discussed, then Compare your results 	

Review Form 1.7

	<p>with the literature, and give reasons/justification in a scientific way if they vary Then give the outcome of that discussion in the last sentence of that para.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similarly, discuss all variables separately • Write within the domain of objective • Omit/delete all other discussions beyond the scope of the objective. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>NEEDS REVISION, LOOK FOR GRAMMER AT PLACES, SENTNECE FORMATION AND COHERANCE NEEDS LOOKED AT PLACES ESPECIALLY IN DISCUSSION AND INTRODUCTION</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise title: make it more meaningful, crispy, and attractive • Delete omit all known, common facts and details beyond the scope of the objective. • Delete /omit all repetitions • Be precise, and to the point - no unnecessary details. • Sentences should be coherent, containing precise details and well-constructed • Check for Grammar at places • The objective, study design and conclusion should be exactly the same everywhere in the manuscript. • Give a 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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ishtiaq Ahmed
Department, University & Country	Al-Nafees Medical College, Isa University, Pakistan