

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

Huan-Keat Chan

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This study investigates the seroprevalence of HBV, HIV, and HCV infections among blood donors in Cameroon. There are several areas where it could be improved:

1. In the abstract, some abbreviations are not defined in the list of abbreviations, which can make it difficult for readers to understand the study.
2. The study could be better justified by providing more information on previous studies in Cameroon regarding transfusion-transmitted infections (TTIs). Additionally, it is unclear if the screening was performed routinely for blood donation.
3. The study period and eligibility criteria should be specified to give readers a better understanding of the study design.
4. The purpose of the questionnaire used in the study and its content should be explained.
5. The authors should clarify why they chose specific tests for screening and why serology tests were still necessary when an Ag/Ab combination test was used.
6. The methods used to report the seroprevalence should be clearly described, and inferential analysis should be included in the study objectives.
7. The study design should be placed in the methodology section rather than the results section.
8. The authors should explain why there is a significant difference in the number of male and female participants.
9. "Family donors" should be defined to avoid confusion.
10. The authors should explain why they singled out HBsAg negative in Figure 1.
11. It would be helpful to present actual p-values rather than using "NS" (not significant).
12. The first paragraph of the discussion section does not offer any new insights.
13. The study is not a survey.
14. It is confusing that the authors state that HBV only relies on the HBsAg test, as this is clearly not the case in this study.
15. The authors should explain why the seroprevalence of HBV in this study is hugely different from that reported in previous studies.
16. The conclusion is repetitive and does not provide any new insights beyond the discussion section.
17. It is unclear how the study's findings lead to the conclusion that "these findings underline the need for confirmatory strategies to avoid blood wastage and to reevaluate viral infections prevalence in African blood donors that may be overestimated."

