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Reviewer’s report:

Compulsory
Page 6…last sentence: delete them and insert then instead

Methodology
I do not understand how many of the eligible women were excluded. This has implication on the generalizability of the study results. Can the authors shed light on this? Including a sketch to show the total population (all pregnant women in the time period), how many were eligible and how many were eventually recruited into the study would suffice.

Discussion
The authors state in the methodology section that the Cite Verte and Biyem-Assi District Hospitals serve both rural and urban patients but they mention in the limitation that the study was urban and therefore its results cannot be extrapolated to rural areas. Having rural women in these hospitals might have affected the overall picture if only urban women were involved. The authors do not acknowledge this in the discussion.

Page 11 2nd paragraph: 4th sentence; re-phrase the sentence. Instead of strongly refute, the authors could say “Our results do not support…… assertion that………

Conclusion
Some recommendations are not possibly based on the results from this study. For example, the suggestion that a woman be screened twice in pregnancy may be based on scientific merit and not results from this study. The study does not mention that the participants were screened twice to determine the rate of subsequent infection after the initial screening. I would remove this recommendation.

Discretionary
Discussion
The discussion section could be shortened

Page 11 3rd paragraph: last sentence. Authors can do without the word “combined”.
Conclusion
This could be significantly trimmed. Aim for three or at most four sentences. For instance, the 1st sentence could be done without

Minor essential revision

Methodology
When were the variables analysed determined, especially for factors associated with HBV i.e. was it a priori or post data collection. It is not clear in the section when they were chosen.

Results
Authors state that the control women were selected as explained in the methodology, but I do not find this in the methodology. Who were these women? Were they part of the 959 women?

Tables
Table 1: I suggest that authors include a column on mean±SD instead of presenting them in the current format.
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