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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr Yasir Waheed,

On behalf of my co-authors, we thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to revise our manuscript, we appreciate you and reviewers very much for positive and constructive comments and suggestions on our manuscript entitled “Prevalence of hepatitis G virus infection among 67,348 blood donors in mainland China” (ID: PUBH-D-19-00359). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches.

We have studied all comments carefully and have made a clean version. Attached please find the revised version, which we would like to submit for your kind consideration.

We sincerely hope that the revised submission is deemed suitable for publication in your journal. I look forward to receiving your decision and please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Looking forward to hearing from you.
Thank you and best regards.

Yours sincerely,

Hongyan Xiong.

Response to reviewer 1 (Yasir Waheed)

The manuscript entitled "Prevalence of hepatitis G virus infection among blood donors in mainland China: A systematic review and meta-analysis from 67,348 blood donors" is well written and well organized.

Please cite a couple of latest papers published in high impact factor journals as suggested below.

Please add HAQ index of China, which is 48 according to the following latest paper.


Please add hepatitis related mortality, from the following paper.


On the basis of your study, you may suggest to add GBV screening for the blood transfusions.

Response: Thanks for your good suggestions, we have added the two references in our manuscript and corrected as you suggested.

Response to reviewer 2 (Bashir Ahmad, PhD)

Significance of Study: The study is very important with a considerable size of sample. Manuscript (if improved) bears a valid merit of publication. However, the preparation of the manuscript and elaborated discussion is needed.

I. Include variables considering geo-environmental aspects since the area of study is too broad and bears a number of socio-economic and environmental factors. Such a big volume and area may be aligned with public health report of China on HGV.
Response: Thanks for your good comment. In our study, we have included the province as variable for analysis, which may represent variable related to geo-environmental aspects, as the province in China are mainly based on geography. To some degree, the province could also represent the economic power. By the way, the province is most convenient subgroup we can obtain.

II. Please mention the details or at least title of figures and figure no. besides respective figure.

Response: Thanks for your good comment, we have added the figure legend at the end of our manuscript.

III. Comparative analysis of EIA and PCR is a good approach. However, this comparison doesn’t match or belong to the objectives of this study. EIA results may be given in a small separate report and mentioned in main document just as a reference. PCR data itself is sufficient for this document.

Response: Thanks for your good suggestion. In this systematic review and meta-analysis, we meant to describe the prevalence of HGV in blood donors. As two methods were adopted in most included studies, EIA/ELISA method was adopted in 74 studies, while PCR method was adopted in 57 studies, the results of two methods may be more comprehensive in understanding the prevalence of HGV in blood donors.

IV. Conclusion and Abstract may be written in better way these existing ones. Improve them. While writing conclusion, try to be consistent with discussion points.

Response: Thanks for your good comment, we have rewritten parts of abstract, discussion and conclusion to make them more consistent as you suggested.

Paper is acceptable with these minor revisions and incorporation of suggestions: Some critics and suggestions are given as:

I. Title:

Given Title: Prevalence of hepatitis G virus infection among blood donors in mainland China

Alternate Title: Prevalence of hepatitis G virus infection among 67,348 blood donors in mainland China. This is a research article and word review is confusing. Further, Meta-analysis is understood method of systematic evaluation, hence may be omitted.

Response: Thanks for your good suggestion, we have corrected as you suggested.
II. Abstract:

III. Introduction

Rewrite: P 3 L11, HGV was first discovered was initially identified in 1995 and classified under the Flaviviridae family [5-8], and the first detected and published in 1996 in China [9].

Response: Thanks for your good suggestion, we have rewritten as you suggested.

L14-18: Transmission is written before occurrence

Write all contents in sequence like Occurrence → Transmission.

Response: Thanks for your good suggestion, we have rearranged these sentences as you suggested.

L28: were shown to be associated instead of ‘was’

Response: Thanks for your good suggestion, we have corrected as you suggested.

L40: Avoid the words like Negros or Negga. Use alternatives names for example through geographic area names etc.

Response: Thanks for your good suggestion. We have corrected as you suggested.

L44: China is a huge country with amount of population infected with hepatitis virus.

Write in academic writing and place this sentence in beginning before Hepatitis G mention.

Response: Thanks for your good suggestion, we have rearranged this sentence and corrected as you suggested.

L53: study about the prevalence of HGV is still absent so far. Still and so far point the same meaning. Write it again.

Response: Thanks for your good suggestion, we have corrected as you suggested.

IV. Methods
All analysis was carried out with R software version 3.4.1 (with the package “meta” [27] (version 4.8-4) for meta-analysis) and QGIS 2.18 was used for map construction. Rewrite it with Version/Make of QGIS.

Response: Thanks for your good suggestion, we have corrected as you suggested.

and the statistic I² [29]. Insert period

Response: Sorry for our carelessness, we have corrected as you suggested.

polymerase chain reaction (PCR)). Remove double parenthesis.

Response: Sorry for our carelessness, we have corrected as you suggested.

gender, if existed (and gender (if existed).

Response: Thanks for your good suggestion, we have corrected as you suggested.

V. Results

Page 5. L52 belongs to Methods part.

Response: Thanks for your good opinion, we have moved this sentence to methods part as you suggested.

published ranged (published ranging from.)

Response: Thanks for your good suggestion, we have corrected as you suggested.

results of EIA, while 57 of PCR. Rewrite

Response: Thanks for your good suggestion, we have corrected as you suggested.

English, Typo and Formatting errors: English is poor and needs major attention.

Response: Thanks for your good suggestion, we have sought an expert for our language editing.
Response: Thanks for carefully review and sorry for our carelessness, we have corrected as you mentioned.

Previous Review:

ManoochehrMakvandi (Reviewer 1):

3- The article is lack of information on paid individual profile.

Response: In this article, we reported both paid and voluntary blood donors in subgroup analysis. According to China policy and statement in your paper, paid blood donation was barred, how did you report the paid donors?

Response: Thanks for your good question. As mentioned in discussion, the Blood Donation Law was implemented in 1998 in China. As the delay of execution, paid blood donation was still reported after 1998. However, a few years later (about 2005), no paid blood donation was reported.