

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_121258
Title of the Manuscript:	SCREENING INDICATIONS, SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC, VIROLOGIC AND RADIOLOGIC CHARACTERISTICS OF VIRAL HEPATITIS B PATIENTS IN A HIGHLY ENDEMIC POPULATION IN SOUTHERN NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.	This article is well because it has worked with a important public health issue. Actually significance should be given for screening to prevention of disease. Language of the article is good. But some portion has mistakes which need to be corrected.													
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is written in capital letter. It should not be like this. It may be "Hepatitis B : Screening, Profile In Highly A Highly Endemic Population In Southern Nigeria"													
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.	In title there is virologic & radiologic profile is highlighted but there is no word about radiologic profile in abstract. Blood for donation should be screened with the triple panel screening kit rather than the regular RDTs and ELISA tests as these have a low sensitivity and are unable to screen HBV mutant strains. This portion needs to be deleted as there is no statistical proof in favour of this in the article.													
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I think introduction portion is too large. There is no word about radiologic finding in discussion. There is no conclusion portion. Recommendation portion should be small and in pointed form. Result of the title should be reflected in conclusion.													
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.	It scientifically ok but needs some corrections. This is a retrospective study which is not said in the methodology. In table 1 there is X, Y, Z. But there is no elaboration about what is this. In table 5 'E antigen comparison' this portion can be written by group 1 & group 2 as it is explained like this in result part like this table <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>DNA</th> <th>HbeAg +</th> <th>HbeAg -</th> <th>P value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Low</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>High</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DNA	HbeAg +	HbeAg -	P value	Low				High				
DNA	HbeAg +	HbeAg -	P value											
Low														
High														
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Reference 1 can be replaced by WHO 2024 report													
Minor REVISION comments														
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	ok													
Optional/General comments														

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>	

Review Form 3

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sayma Rahman Munmun
Department, University & Country	Chattogram Medical College Hospital, Bangladesh