



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Microbiology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	2013_BMRJ_7851
Title of the Manuscript:	Molecular Characterization of hepatitis B virus circulating in asymptomatic and symptomatic carrier in Côte d'Ivoire
Type of the 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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Major Revision is needed English grammar is Poor that should be improved. There is incomplete data about the genotype prevalence with reference to your geographical area. As you mentioned only few data exist, then it should be added. Methods are not described in detail. Other few queries are: • The DNA extraction Kit mentioned (Promega Cat. No. 1125) is used to extract DNA from the whole blood rather Serum or Plasma. Second, why you used Serum and plasma separately for serological and Molecular assays respectively? DNA may be extracted from the serum sample as mentioned in different studies. • You also mentioned in Method section, line 84 “An aliquot of separated plasma from the PCR positive samples were used for the 85 genotyping assay”. What was its need? You may use the different aliquot of extracted DNA. • Which concentration of ethidium bromide was used? • The quality of gel photograph is not good. • Similarly the data mentioned in Tables is described in the text which is not needed to illustrate in text in such detail. There is also no need to present data in form of three tables but only one table is enough. Results are poorly presented. There should be some table or graph	DNA can be extracted from serum or plasma, but we used serum and plasma to further studies on viral hepatitis C. We used serum for ELISA tests and We did not want to work on the same samples. So we used the plasma which had not been touched to avoid contamination I want to speak of the PCR product. It will be corrected in the text.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	for good presentation. Second it is not mentioned anywhere what was the number of Symptomatic and asymptomatic carriers among 54 positive patients on PCR. Discussion is needed major consideration. Present discussion shows over interpretation of results. It is important to clearly define and appropriately discuss your study's results.	The tables are only to mention the sequences of the primers used. I have grouped the tables into one by removing certain details which are already mentioned in the text. It has been corrected: Results have been presented in tables in the text.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		