

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Hematology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AHRJ_77238
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Physicians' Motivation, Willingness and Opinion on Blood Donation
Type of the Article	Original Research Article















General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

Review Form 1.6

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<div><div></div> Even if it is good tittle, I have one concern, what is your interest? Do you want to assess motivation, willingness and opinion of physicians to donate blood by themselves? Or want to their motivation, willingness and opinion in promoting, counselling others to donate blood?</div> <div><div></div> Why you focus on physicians? Why not other population of Nigeria?</div> <div><div></div> This is an interesting topic but unfortunately, the paper needs quite some more work.</div> <div><div></div> Do not include too much detail in the abstract such as statistical method, confidence intervals or likewise. Start with a small problem statement; “so what is at stake here”..... Or it must show the real gap of the problem. An abstract should inspire readers to grasp the idea and to look for more detail in the text. It must include all the components of the article in a short and precise way.</div> <div><div></div> In the introduction section I miss the gap related with motivation, willingness, and opinion on blood donation among health professionals specially physicians worldwide as well as in the study area</div> <div><div></div> Again in the introduction section I expect that the efforts of concerned body like Red cross and WHO in increasing voluntary blood donors during COVID 19 pandemic worldwide as well as in the study area</div> <div><div></div> In method section, the way of approaching or addressing doctors in Nigeria is not clearly stated? How do you approach them? How the questionnaire is accessible for doctors only since it is web based study.</div> <div><div></div> Source population of your study must be stated</div> <div><div></div> The way of writing study design needs modification</div> <div><div></div> You authors stated that the questionnaire was self-created. If so was reliability and validity test was done? Stastical values of reliability and validity test like crobach's α must be mentioned here.</div> <div><div></div> I miss your data measurement/ operational definition in your method and material section. How do you measure knowledge and practice of physicians on blood donation? When you say good knowledge and good practice (one in life time, one per three month,one per six month, one per year...) on blood donation?</div> <div><div></div> In your data analysis plan I also miss what software or office you use for data entry. Epi data, epiinfo, or excel?</div> <div><div></div> Among which variables do you do association? Since you mentioned odds ratio, CI and p-value</div> <div><div></div> It is better to use chi square to see the association between variables instead of</div> <div></div>	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>odds ratio, CI. Since it is descriptive study.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">✚ Ethical considerations paragraph may be improved to include confidentiality and issues of anonymity.✚ Generally method section needs more work.✚ In result section what was the response rate? Was it 100% or are all 1153 participants involved in the study?✚ How much of study participants do have good knowledge among 9 questions on blood donation? It must be included in the result.✚ How much of study participants do have good practice.✚ It is better to use chi square to see association between male and female doctors regarding blood donation instead of odds ratio, CI.✚ I miss a mote thick discussions on ways forward, based on the findings.✚ The authors may want to write briefly about limitations and straight of their study approach/methodological considerations at the end of the Discussion section to improve rigour.✚ The authors need to be include implication of this study at the end of Discussion section✚ Forwarding or recommendation also needed	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">✚ Language rewriting needs through✚ Sentence construction needs revision	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">✚ The paper is generally good but I suggest you rectify my few suggests prior publication✚ The authors need more work on method section	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Nigus Kassie
Department, University & Country	Dire Dawa University, Ethiopia