



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	2015_IJTDH_17400
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of Anti-HBc in HIV patients on ART in Ekiti, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Case Study

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	The authors should present their results in a table. This table should show the actual number of female and male patients that were positive, not just percentages. The table should also show how many individuals in each age group and in the occupational groups I cannot make the numbers fit. 22 patients of the 188 were positive. This is 11.7%. 43 were males and the seroprevalence among males was 3.13% (or 3.23%; see comment minor revision). This is 1.35 or 1.39 patients? Same for women (n=145), of whom 8.3% were positive; i.e. 12 patients. In total were 22 patients positive, but 1.39 + 12 is not 22? Actual numbers should also be given for the different occupational groups.	This is a very good observation and our results had been presented in table 1 and 11 6/188 (3.19%) for male and 16/188 (8.51) and female were corrected prevalence as shown in table 1 $6(3.19\%) + 16(8.51) = 22 (11.7\%)$ Actual number had been given in table 2
Minor REVISION comments	Title: mentions patients on ART. This should be mentioned in 1.2 Materials and Methods Abstract, line 22: the authors conclude that all HIV-infected patients should be screened before starting antiretroviral therapy, while they have only tested patients on treatment. How can such a conclusion be	ART had been included. HIV Clinic does not screen them for markers of Hepatitis B virus including Anti HBc IgM so I am suggesting they should be screened for AntiHBc



SDI Review Form 1.6

	made if no patients that were not treated were examined? Line 17: 3.23% of the males were positive, while lane 78 it says 3.13% Line 17: the word “was” should be removed.	IgM. This is because HIV had been found to worsen liver diseases in HIV- HBV coinfection. It had been corrected Agree
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		