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Reviewer's report:

• The Status of HBV infection and vaccination among health care workers in a Public General Hospital in General this article has no innovation just a statistics in a population.
• Comments
1. Poor English (Not scientific language)
2. Did not mention the size of cohort. Only presenting percent in the abstract
3. Line 83. Mentioned the size of cohort is 1420. Not clear are these the whole number of HCWs in that hospital. If no how did he select the sample?
4. How did he conduct the survey? Interview survey, through the mail or self-reporting and what are the questions included in his survey.
5. In line 90. He mentioned that the HCW were aged from 24-51 and then on line 92 he mentioned that 146 below age 24 and many over age 51. Therefore, data is conflicting and I am not sure which is which is correct?
6. In line 97 the ELISA kit provided by Shanghai industrial division biotechnology limited company made in China. What is the sensitivity of the kit and supporting references for this kit?
7. What about the ranges of used-kit in this survey? Was there the same range in brochure of the kit?
8. How many times they run test. Once or twice?
9. Line 122-126 about Status of antibody produced by natural infection versus by vaccination. My comment is s it reliable? did all the staffs remember been vaccinated or no? Or it was written in their vaccination card? If there is vaccination card then why the rate of hepatitis B vaccination in HCW is low in the Public General Hospital?
10. Line 134 when mention the rate of contracting HBV in needle stick injury is about 6-30% which is scientifically wrong because it can be even more higher than this in patient with very high viral load. Reference must be included.
11. Discussion
a. Must be started by a giving the main finding of the present survey in brief.
b. This part must be revised. It s not well managed.
12. References must be updated and used more article to compare the results
and findings. Several recent articles reviewed the same subject not included in this study.

13. What is the strength and weakness of this study and why not mentioned in the text.

**Level of interest:** An article of insufficient interest to warrant publication in a scientific/medical journal

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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