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Reviewer's report:

Systematic review and meta-analysis of the prevalence of hepatitis B virus is much essential and interesting specially in high prevalence regions, like Ethiopia; further useful to assess more precise estimate of the prevalence and overall burden of the disease and indicating its control policies.

Authors have taken up an updated systematic review and meta-analysis on the studies of prevalence of hepatitis B virus in Ethiopia during 2010-2019. Under the study design, both the authors screened and accessed the data independently. While integrating and analyzing these data, authors used random-effect model for cross study heterogeneity assessment, along with sub-group and sensitivity analysis. Having the prime objective, to estimate the pooled prevalence of HBV in Ethiopia, authors concluded the overall pooled prevalence of HBV in Ethiopia was high.

I liked reading the manuscript with its simplicity in method and the presentation, although the method finally limited to the cross sectional studies only (except one) and limited to one location. Generalization of these results may require more caution further. Authors have mentioned the study limitations for making it clear.

I would suggest author to clarify or address the following issues for broader readers.

1. Page 5 (Line 10-12) : Eligibility criteria: I would prefer to revise the sentence and make simple (in wordings). "Further, studies …………… were the inclusion criteria".

2. Authors have mentioned, the discrepancies in data extract between the two independent reviewers were resolved by discussion. It is not clear how is this been attained. Is the resolve been made as a subjective exercise? Generally it is done by recheck. Here author need to be clear on the process.

3. Authors found "no influence on overall effect estimate while removing a single study at a time from a analysis…". Yes one can refer the figure 2 and guess the robustness of these studies. But I hope author have assess this trough any sensitivity analysis as well, missing in the text or not clear. I would ask authors to represent this results more specifically.

4. Meta-regression, provides the sources of heterogeneity as province, study group, screening method, and quality of papers, with highest for "quality of papers". The proper interpretation of such results is missing in the text. Should be included.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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