

# Review of: "Serological detection strategy and prevalence of HIV and Viral Hepatitis B and C in blood donors in Yaoundé Cameroon"

Marisa Lúcia Romani Paraboni<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> URI Campus de Erechim

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for the opportunity to evaluate the work. The study with blood donors is relevant and timely. However, the manuscript requires some adaptations. Some writing errors should be corrected, and the following suggestions:

**1. Title :** Doesn't agree with the research a prevalence study is observed.

## **2. Materials and methods:**

a) The inclusion and exclusion criteria in the study were not clear.

b) “ *The study obtained an authorization for research for the General Directorate and the Ethical Clearance from the Regional Ethical Committee for Center Region, Yaounde*”:

It would be important to quote the Committee number.

## **3. Results:**

a) “*Figure 1. Flow chart of serological investigations of viral infections in blood donations collected at the University Teaching Hospital Blood Service, Yaoundé, Cameroon*”:

It is described: blood donors 1,162 being written with a comma, it is suggested to put a period (1.162)

b) *Table 1. Demographic and serological characteristics of 1,162 Cameroonian blood donors at the Yaounde University Teaching Hospital in 2017*: The INNO-LIA HCV and HIV BLOT results were confusing, where you need to inform how the selection of patients for confirmatory tests was carried out, only the positive results were released, leaving doubts about the undetermined and unconfirmed ones.

c) *The results: All of the 91 samples positive HBsAg positive were also positive for HBcAb. . In the 1071 HBsAg negative participants, the prevalence of HBcAb was 48.7% (n=522). In seronegative participants for HBsAg, HCV and HIV, the prevalence of HBcAb was 48.8% (n=511).* The HBcAb marker was not commented on in the introduction, it was not clearly mentioned in the objectives, leaving confusing and dubious results for this screening. They were also not commented on in the conclusion. What would be the purpose of this dosage?

#### 4. Discussion

a) “From the **1072 HBsAg negative** participants, 522 were positive for HBcAb (**48.8%**) and the frequency of HBcAb only positive donors was 44.4% (516/1162)”:

Check how it was written in the discussion because it is different from results found in the study.

#### 5. Conclusion:

The conclusion can be summarized