

**Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Pathogen Research</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJPR_83180
Title of the Manuscript:	SEROPREVALENCE OF HUMAN PAPILLOMAVIRUS TYPE 16 IMMUNOGLOBULIN G ANTIBODIES (HPV 16-IgG) AMONG WOMEN ATTENDING GENERAL HOSPITAL KAGARKO, KAGARKO LGA, KADUNA STATE
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.journalijpr.com/index.php/IJPR/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>The manuscript is extremely relevant for public health, regarding the programming, planning and execution of public health policies focused on the knowledge of the epidemiological profile of HPV16 cases and their impacts on women's health, and in the context of strengthening campaigns of vaccination for this target audience. It is noteworthy that the topic under discussion reinforces the importance of health planning, with emphasis on promotion (sexual education) and prevention (HPV vaccination). In short, the authors need to be more cohesive, coherent and objective in the presentation of the theme, in order to favor greater explanation and scientific basis for the findings.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript has potential for publication, as long as it meets the following considerations:</p> <p>1) Introduction: It is necessary to summarize the problem; Bring literature data at an international, national and local level (if any); Present the magnitude, epidemiology and population profile on the scene. Justification and relevance. Presentation of the objective more clearly.</p> <p>2) Method: What are the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the participants? Data collection period? How was the population sampled? How did data collection take place (before consultations? Environment? Time?); Was the research submitted to the Research Ethics Committee? The authors refer that they only obtained authorization from the Ministry of Health of the State. The authors list the study variables, however they do not describe each one of them; Also, do they report that the immunization/vaccination status was evaluated, but do they not bring these data into the results?; They do not make it clear which dependent variable.</p> <p>3) Results: I suggest to unify tables 2, 3 and 4 in a single table (sociodemographic data); Present the results in a more direct and objective way; Avoid repetition of information in the table in textual form, listing the main results.</p> <p>The authors present the significant associations in the table, but they did not list them in textual form.</p> <p>5) Discussion: It is suggested to respond to the purpose of the manuscript, first. Soon after, bring the associations and the main findings; Still, there was a lack of more objectivity, clarity and cohesion in the discussion of data, a critical presentation of the authors regarding their opinions regarding the findings of the study. Implications for the scientific community and clinical practice. Avoid repetition of results, in full, in textual form. Example: being a young adult woman, divorced, are more likely to be infected with HPV16. Furthermore, age at first sexual intercourse, number of sexual partners and partners with multiple sexual partners present a significant association with HPV seropositivity16;</p> <p>6) Conclusion: Objectivity was lacking. It does not respond to the objectives proposed by the investigation. Still, the conclusion was not supported by the findings.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Braulio Vieira de Sousa Borges
Department, University & Country	Federal University of Piaui, Brazil