

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

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>1. Yes, The manuscript provides important evidence to consider in health policies, for example, vaccination against hepatitis B in health personnel.</p> <p>2. Yes, it is suitable.</p> <p>3. Yes, it is comprehensive</p> <p>4. Yes, in general terms</p> <p>5. Yes</p> <p>6. The references sufficient and recent</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	Yes	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The article is interesting and of great importance, I only present some suggestions that can complement your excellent work refers correctly in bibliographic reference 15 to Fonzo's work but you do not clearly mention anything about this observation made in the same work "As shown by results of the logistic regressions, not only the age at the first dose, but also an extension of time between 2nd and 3rd dose is correlated with a lower risk of titre <10 IU/L in infants, in particular a 11% reduction per month, while no correlation was noted with the time between the 1st and 2nd dose."</p> <p>I also suggest expanding the discussion between the great contrast in the results shown in Figure 2 and Figure 4, specifically to what attribute the difference.</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:	Veronica Ruiz Gonzalez
Department, University & Country	Mexico