Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	**International Blood Research & Reviews**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IBRR_110670**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Comparative Assessment of the Haematological Viability of Blood Under Different Storage Temperature in RSUTH Blood Bank In Port Harcourt, Nigeria.**
Type of the Article	**Original**

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)*
Compulsory REVISION comments **1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?** (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) **2. Is the title of the article suitable?** (If not please suggest an alternative title) **3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?** **4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?** **5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?** **6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.** **(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)**	**This manuscript has no significant importance for the scientific community because the study was done on facts that have been used by the American Association of Blood Banks (AABB) and World Health Organization (WHO). AABB developed different guidelines and standards on blood safety and storage. So, AABB has recommended to store whole blood and concentrated red cells at 2-6 ^{o}c, platelets at room temperature and plasma products at <-18 ^{o}c. Therefore, the relevance of this manuscript is under question.** **The title of the manuscript is good.** **Ye, it is comprehensive** **Yes, but the subsection entitled "Relationship Between Weights of The Study Subjects And Changes in Their Haematological Parameters" is not appropriate because it is not the objective of the study. Therefore, the statistical analysis is also unnecessary.** **Yes, Scientifically, it is true.** **No, the references are not sufficient and not properly cited. It didn't show the findings of the previous research clearly. The authors simply said "agree with". But most of the references are recently published.**	
Minor REVISION comments **1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?**	**The language is not properly written; there are grammatical, spelling, spacing, punctuation and capitalization errors. incomplete sentences statements are also seen in the document**	
Optional/General comments		

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)*	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Aytenew Atnaf Workineh**
Department, University & Country	**Debre Markos University, Ethiopia**