Review Form 3

Journal Name:	**International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJR2H_126209**
Title of the Manuscript:	**The Seroprevalence of Transfusion-Transmissible Pathogens: A Retrospective Study in Port Harcourt, Nigeria**
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty'**, provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.
To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/
Benefits for Reviewers: https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory 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 minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	**Manuscript is important to the scientific community, since the data presented are in consensus with the Quality of Life, Income Strata, and other social determinants of health. This data might be useful for the other researchers of public health, working on subject of infectious diseases in underdeveloped/low-income strata countries.**	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	**The title is relevant, however, the authors might choose to add few keywords in the title such as "cross-sectional study", to gain more visibility.**	
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.	**Language change is needed in the abstract section. Also, the grammatical mistakes should be revisited and corrected.:** **3rd line: "**The inadequacies associated the national blood transfusion" check and correct grammar. Check for spelling in Keywords such as "transfusion". **Last line** of Methodology section "The prevalence for HBV was" : Correct it grammatically to "The prevalence of HBV". Please correct other parts accordingly.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	**Conclusion needs to be corrected grammatically in sentence framing. Title mentions: "Seroprevalence of Four Transfusion Transmissible pathogens (HBV, HBV, HIV and Syphilis) among Blood Donors". Please check this at several other places.**	
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 just a compiled report about blood borne infected transfusion report along with demography. The study could not reach to a scientific conclusion, such as data driven policy making, or any sort of scientific outcome except demographic data reporting. Author may compare data points prevalence of transmission-based incidents among underdeveloped-developing-developed countries.**	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	**The number of references used are very less. The study should be supported by 50-60 references making it much interesting for readers. There should be some references form systematic reviews and meta-analysis, if evidence are available. This would increase more weight to the problem discussed.**	
Minor REVISION comments **Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	Language must be improved at many places.	
Optional/General comments	Add more discussion to the discussion body. Make it a masterpiece of critical literature review on seroprevalence.	

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:	**Abhishek Sharma**
Department, University & Country	**C K Birla Hospital, Gurugram, India**