

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research and Reports in Hepatology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRRHE_123805
Title of the Manuscript:	A Cross-Sectional Investigation of the Public Health Consequences of Hepatitis B infection among Abattoir Workers in Port Harcourt Nigeria
Type of the 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 (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 subject seems interesting, but the content is not in line with it. Hence all the disappointment.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	NO	
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.	NO	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	NO	
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.	NO	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	NO	

Review Form 3

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>		
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>This study had two objectives, that of determining the prevalence of hepatitis B virus among slaughterers in public slaughterhouses in Port Harcourt and the second objective was to determine the consequences on public health. Objectives are already difficult to achieve by a retrospective study. The introductory part does not establish the link of transmission between humans and animals in a clear way and it dwells on the manifestation of hepatitis in humans, which is already known. It would have been interesting if the author had focused on the relationship that the title of his article seems to announce.</p> <p>Also, in the conclusion the results obtained are in the same range as the prevalence among the general population of the metropolis and slaughterhouse workers do not seem to be exposed to higher levels of risk of infection than those faced by the general population. The prevalence of 6.2% is not acceptable. Efforts must be intensified to eradicate HBV infection through mass vaccination and other safety practices.</p> <p>The results and conclusion of this study do not add anything to what is already known and are not in accordance with either the objectives or the title of the article.</p> <p>This work presents many inadequacies from the introduction to the conclusion through the objectives and the methodology. No link is clearly established between the different parts of this article. In my opinion the title of this article would be: the prevalence of hepatitis B infection among the staff of public slaughterhouses in Port Harcourt.</p> <p>And if this is the title, it will not have brought anything new to what is already known.</p> <p>The right approach would have been to establish the prevalence among the staff of public slaughterhouses in Port Harcourt and among cattle from the same site. by trying to establish the exposure factors to explain this zoonotic transmission. Such a study should take enough time to produce publishable results and not a retrospective. Because any researcher knows well the limits of such a study in terms of lack of data.</p>	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Kasamba Ilunga Eric</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Université de Lubumbashi, RD Congo</p>