

Paper: “Exploring Disease Manifestations and Influencing Factors in Acute and Chronic Hepatitis B”

Submitted: 14 August 2024

Accepted: 06 November 2024

Published: 30 November 2024

Corresponding Author: Napoleon Bellua Sam

Doi: [10.19044/esj.2024.v20n33p59](https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2024.v20n33p59)

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Markela Muca
University of Tirana, Albania

Reviewer 2: Brian Sloboda
University of Maryland, USA

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2024

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title:	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper:	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper:	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper:	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>The title is clear and accurately reflects the main idea of the paper.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	2

<i>The abstract should be reorganized better.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The article is written correctly except for some words that could have been formulated more appropriately in the context of the sentence. The article contains a few grammatical and spelling errors.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>Study methods are not clearly explained. Logistic regression Analysis is mentioned, but it is not explained in detail and is not accompanied by a figure to have a correct perception of the implemented method. In one paragraph, some tests for checking the independence between two variables are mentioned, but they are not cited. It has not been explained what is the reason for checking the independence of the variables. As a theme, the article is interesting but had to be treated more concretely.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
<i>Several contingency tables have been built which are placed in a single table. I would suggest that the contingency tables should be divided into one table for each pair of variables in such a way that the results are more distinct.</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	
<i>Usually, conclusions summarize the content by spotting the literature gap, the methods proposed, and the results. The introduction and the discussion paragraph can be rearranged into one introduction and the discussion paragraph can be shortened Also, the sample of patients is too small to undertake a representative study on the purpose of this paper</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	
<i>References look good, and are comprehensive and appropriate.</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Suggestions:

1. Re organize the abstract, introduction and discussion to the article.
2. To include in the article a mathematical analysis by building a model to clarify (logistic equation) which factors influence in Acute and Chronic Hepatitis B
3. The article needs the basic electronic data to be processed through SPSS program to be able to process data issue information and interpret.
4. The number of patients should be greater and not 569 people. To specify the number of Demographic data and the number of manifestations on this disease were compared between AHB and CHB patients.
This number is not representative of such a study.
5. The format of the tables should be adjusted. In Table 1 is missing the table title.

Reviewer D:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

The TITLE is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.

The title of the paper is clear and describes the content of the paper.

The ABSTRACT clearly presents objects, methods, and results.

The abstract describes the objects, methods, and the results well.

There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.

The review of the literature and the empirical results of the paper should be written in the past tense because it already happened.

The authors should consider a colleague or a professional editor to edit this paper for future submissions to improve the flow of the paper.

In the headings of the paper such as Collection of Clinical and laboratory, Statistical analysis, Influencing factors of acute and chronic HB should be rewritten as Collection of Clinical and Laboratory, Statistical Analysis, Influencing Factors of Acute and Chronic HB.

The study METHODS are explained clearly.

Here are comments on the methods:

Under the logistic regression, the authors used acronym OR. The acronym "OR" (under the results of logistic regression) is not defined in the text anywhere.

Where is a table summarizing the results from the logistic regression? It would be nice to know how well the model fits. A table summarizing these results would be helpful for the readers.

What do the OR mean? This is no discussion of this in the paper.

For the binary logistic regression, where is a table summarizing the results from the binary logistic regression? A table summarizing these results would be helpful for the readers.

For the binary logistic regression, did the authors test for misspecification? Did they also test for it for the logistic regression?

For the logistic and the binary logistic use robust standard errors? Robust clustered standard errors? Did the authors suspect heteroscedasticity in the error terms? If so the parameters may be inconsistent so adjusting the standard errors would result in the standard error being consistent

when the parameter remains inconsistent. An examination of this would be important.

How did the empirical results differ between the logistic regression and the binary logistic regression? The readers may like to know these differences.

The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.

The authors should breakout the introduction into the sections Introduction and Review of the Literature. The introduction in its current form is too long.

The CONCLUSION or summary is accurate and supported by the content.

Yes it does. There are no issues with the conclusions

The list of REFERENCES is comprehensive and appropriate.

The list of references is comprehensive and appropriate

Please rate the TITLE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the ABSTRACT of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Please rate the LANGUAGE of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

3

Please rate the METHODS of this paper.

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

2

*Please rate the **BODY** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

4

*Please rate the **CONCLUSION** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

*Please rate the **REFERENCES** of this paper.*

[Poor] **1-5** [Excellent]

5

Overall Recommendation!!!

Return for major revision and resubmission

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

See the comments presented in preceding sections of this review.
