

Review Form2

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2123
Title of the Manuscript:	Seroprevalence of Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies in Healthcare Workers
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is crucial for the scientific community as it provides essential data on the seroprevalence of SARS-CoV-2 antibodies among healthcare workers, a group at high risk during the COVID-19 pandemic. The findings underscore the importance of proper protective measures, such as PPE training and adequate ventilation, in mitigating infection risks. I appreciate the manuscript's comprehensive approach, linking seroprevalence with specific risk factors and preventive strategies, which can inform policy and enhance infection control practices. However, the manuscript could benefit from clearer writing and more detailed methodology to strengthen its impact and reproducibility.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The current title, "Seroprevalence of Anti-SARS-CoV-2 Antibodies in Healthcare Workers," is suitable as it clearly indicates the study's focus.	

Review Form2

Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract provides a general overview of the study but could benefit from greater clarity and comprehensiveness. Here are some suggestions for improvement: 1. Introduction to the Problem: Briefly mention the importance of studying seroprevalence among healthcare workers at the beginning. 2. Objective: Clearly state the objective of the study. 3. Methods: Provide a brief overview of the study design, sample size, and methods used for seroprevalence testing. 4. Key Findings: Summarize the main findings more clearly, including specific data on seroprevalence rates and the identified risk factors. 5. Conclusion and Implications: Highlight the significance of the findings and their implications for public health and infection control strategies. Suggested Revised Abstract The state of Guanajuato in Mexico has a high frequency of confirmed COVID-19 cases, significantly affecting healthcare workers due to their contact with infected patients. This study aims to investigate the seroprevalence of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 among healthcare workers and identify associated risk factors. We conducted serological tests on healthcare workers from various units and analyzed the association between seropositivity, work environment, community exposure, and personal protective equipment (PPE) training. Our findings show a significant seroprevalence rate, with higher rates in specific work units and among those with greater community exposure. Proper PPE training demonstrated a protective effect. These results underscore the need for continuous surveillance, proper training, and effective preventive strategies to protect healthcare workers. Maintaining surveillance infrastructures and ensuring adequate ventilation in workspaces are priority measures to mitigate the impact of future COVID-19 waves. This revised abstract provides a clearer and more structured summary of the study, making it easier for readers to grasp the key points.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-structured with clear subsections, which enhance readability and organization.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound due to its rigorous methodological approach and comprehensive analysis. The use of serological tests to assess the presence of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibodies among healthcare workers ensures accurate and reliable results. The study's consideration of various risk factors, such as work environment, community exposure, and PPE training, provides a nuanced understanding of seroprevalence. Additionally, the statistical analysis used to identify significant associations further strengthens the validity of the findings, making a valuable contribution to the existing literature on COVID-19 and infection control in healthcare settings.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The sufficiency and recency of the references are crucial for supporting the manuscript's claims and ensuring it reflects the current state of research. Here are some points to consider regarding the references: 1. Sufficiency: The manuscript includes a reasonable number of references to support its claims and provide context. However, it's important to ensure that all key points, especially those related to recent findings and guidelines, are adequately supported by references. 2. Recency: Given the rapidly evolving nature of COVID-19 research, it's essential that the references include the most up-to-date studies and guidelines.	

Review Form2

	Suggestions for Additional References 1. Recent Seroprevalence Studies: - Recent large-scale seroprevalence studies in various regions can provide additional context and comparisons for the findings. For example: - Lai, C. C., Wang, J. H., & Hsueh, P. R. (2020). Population-based seroprevalence surveys of anti-SARS-CoV-2 antibody: An up-to-date review. International Journal of Infectious Diseases, 101, 314-322. 2. Impact of PPE and Training: - Studies that specifically address the effectiveness of PPE and training in healthcare settings can strengthen the discussion on these aspects. For example: - Verbeek, J. H., Rajamaki, B., Ijaz, S., et al. (2020). Personal protective equipment for preventing highly infectious diseases due to exposure to contaminated body fluids in healthcare staff. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, (4), CD011621. 3. Vaccine Efficacy and Antibody Duration: - Recent studies on vaccine efficacy and the duration of antibody presence post-vaccination can provide relevant insights. For example: - Suthar, M. S., Arunachalam, P. S., Hu, M., et al. (2021). Durability of immune responses to the BNT162b2 mRNA vaccine. New England Journal of Medicine, 385(10), 873-874. 4. General COVID-19 Guidelines: - Updated guidelines from health organizations like the CDC and WHO on infection control practices and PPE use in healthcare settings: - Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). (2021). Interim Infection Prevention and Control Recommendations for Healthcare Personnel During the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Pandemic.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language and English quality of the article require some improvement to meet the standards for scholarly communication. While the manuscript presents its scientific findings clearly, there are several areas where the language can be refined for better clarity and professionalism.	
Optional/General comments	no	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ashish
Department, University & Country	Institute of Medical Science, Banaras Hindu University, India