

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_129892
Title of the Manuscript:	Vaccination status and knowledge of viral Hepatitis B: A World Hepatitis Day survey
Type of the Article	Cross-sectional study

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is important for the scientific community because it identifies gaps in Hepatitis B vaccine awareness and uptake in Rivers State, Nigeria. It highlights the need for targeted educational campaigns and better vaccine accessibility. The findings can help reduce the burden of Hepatitis B in high-risk populations and contribute to understanding vaccine hesitancy in developing regions.	Noted
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title "Vaccination status and knowledge of viral Hepatitis B: A World Hepatitis Day survey" is suitable as it accurately reflects the content and scope of the study. It clearly indicates the focus on vaccination status, knowledge of Hepatitis B, and the context of the World Hepatitis Day survey. However, I think it is more appropriate for the title to be more specific. "Hepatitis B Vaccine Awareness and Uptake: Insights from a World Hepatitis Day Survey in Rivers State, Nigeria."	Title has been revised
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.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive as it covers the background, methodology, results, and conclusion of the study. However, it could be improved by including specific statistics from the results section to provide a clearer picture of the findings. For example, mentioning the exact percentage of participants aware of the HBV vaccine and the percentage of those vaccinated would add more depth. Additionally, highlighting the main barriers to vaccination identified in the study would make the abstract more informative.	Yes
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct. It follows a structured methodology, uses validated tools, and provides a thorough analysis of the data collected. The statistical methods used are appropriate for the study's objectives. The results are presented clearly, and the conclusions are supported by the data. Overall, the manuscript provides valuable insights into Hepatitis B vaccine awareness and uptake in Rivers State, Nigeria.	ok
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The references in the draft are sufficient and up to date. They contain relevant studies and data that support the findings and issues of the research.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript is well-written, clear, and concise, making it easy to understand the study's objectives, methodology, results, and conclusions.	Ok
Optional/General comments	-More participants could have been included in the study. -The title of article is more appropriate for the title to be more specific. "Hepatitis B Vaccine Awareness and Uptake: Insights from a World Hepatitis Day Survey in Rivers State, Nigeria."	Revised

Review Form 3

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>	