

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_86223
Title of the Manuscript:	Sero-Epidemiology of Transfusion Transmissible Hepatitis B, C and E among Blood Donors in Ekiti, Southwestern Nigeria: A Cross-sectional Study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### **General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>In the "Abstract's Background" section, to change "The aim of this study is" to "The aim of the study was"</p> <p>In the Abstract's Result section, to complete the hanging phrase "No dual Infection" into a sentence.</p> <p>To mention the Study Design in the "Abstract" section, such as in the Methods e.g. "In this Cross sectional Study, HBsAg were....."</p> <p>Given the weaknesses of Consecutive or Total enumerative Sampling Technique, which is a non-Probability or non-randomization-based criteria, I will be very careful in my Conclusions. Instead of "pictured a need", in the Abstract's Conclusion section, I would be modest and use "may picture the need". I would also not leave it to the reviewer, to identify this obvious "Limitation" of the study. I would include a Paragraph in the Methods section on justification or Why the Consecutive Sampling Technique was used Just to prevent such as convenience, constraints of time, relative rarity of the condition in the population, inclusion of every eligible subject till required sample size is achieved, hence ease, quick and cheap to conduct etc, etc. And in the Conclusion of the paper, I include a section on the Limitation of the study and how only a conclusion on association is possible and then I would propose a much larger study utilizing more robust, Probability/Randomization sampling Criteria to confirm the findings, of which this Cross sectional Study forms the basis. Add/Insert Page numbers to your paper, for ease of review</p> <p>Kindly put the Vancouver References (Intext reference numbers inside or before the fullstops</p> <p>Change "Sub-Saharan" to "sub-Saharan"</p> <p>Add years of publication to all cited references in the text, throughout the article including the discussion. For instance in stead of "Traore et al" use Traore et al. (Year)</p> <p>Please take all the Tables of the Results to the Results Sections above the respective Results sections and Remove or separate the Title of Table 2 and 3 from the Table it self.</p> <p>Consistency in referencing, if you Italice, Italice all and vice versa (Reference 20 and 34)</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>In the Statistical Analysis section and the interpretation of the results ( e.g. the P-value or p&lt;0. 05 was used to interprete the results) and make the correction " results presented in the form of Tables and Graphs"</p> <p>Ensure consistency of the subtitles (centered or left aligned)</p> <p>In discussion section second paragraph, line 7, caitalize the word "and"</p>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>Consider starting your sentences with definite article "The" to define things (e.g. The HBsAg, The antibodies) nouns (variations, blood donors etc), adjectives,adverbs as specific or particular.</p> <p>Consider revising the use of HEV-IgM and HEV-IgG to "confirm" the results to "support" the initial findings. These are also screening tests not confirmatory, the only difference is specificity or testing of the individual Immunoglobulin separately</p> <p>In the Limitations of the study consider including the proble of false positives of up to 1 in 5 with rapid antibody tests, cross reactivity reactions of the rapid screening tests with antibodies for Lupus, Rheumatoid arthritis among other diseases, hence the need to use</p>	

**Review Form 1.6**

	the more specific HEV-IgM and HEV-IgG	
--	---------------------------------------	--

**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:	Mburu Samuel
Department, University & Country	Kirinyaga University, Kenya