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 <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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 agre highlight that part in the man his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	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?	
	Why you focus on physicians? Why not other population of Nigeria?	
	4 This is an interesting topic but unfortunately, the paper needs quite some more	
	work.	
	4 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.	
	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	
	4 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	
	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.	
	Source population of your study must be stated	
	The way of writing study design needs modification	
	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.	
	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?	
	In your data analysis plan I also miss what software or office you use for data	
	entry. Epi data, epiinfo, or excel?	
	Among which variables do you do association? Since you mentioned odds ratio, CI	
	and p-value	
	It is better to use chi square to see the association between variables instead of	

reed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and nanuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write

Review Form 1.6

edds ratio, CI. Since it is descriptive study. 4 Ethical considerations paragraph may be improved to include confidentiality and issues of anonymity. 4 Generally method section needs more work. 4 In result soction what was the response rate? Was it 100% or are all 1153 participants involved in the study? 4 How much of study participants do have good knowledge among 9 questions on blood donation? It must be included in the result. 4 How much of study participants do have good practice. 4 It is better to use chi square to see association between male and female doctors regarding blood donation instaad of odds ratio, CI. 4 I miss a mote thick discussions on ways forward, based on the findings. 4 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. 4 The authors need to be include implication of this study at the end of Discussion section to section 4 Forwarding or recommendation also needed Minor REVISION comments 4 4 The paper is generally good but I suggest you rectify my few suggests prior publication 4 The paper is generally good but I suggest you rectify my few suggests prior publication 4 The authors need more work on method section		-	
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, Cl. It 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 Language rewriting needs through Sentence construction needs revision Optional/General comments		odds ratio, CI. Since it is descriptive study.	
4 Generally method section needs more work. 4 In result section what was the response rate? Was it 100% or are all 1153 participants involved in the study? 4 How much of study participants do have good knowledge among 9 questions on blood donation? It must be included in the result. 4 How much of study participants do have good practice. 4 It is better to use chi square to see association between male and female doctors regarding blood donation instead of odds ratio, Cl. 4 I miss a mote thick discussions on ways forward, based on the findings. 4 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. 4 The authors need to be include implication of this study at the end of Discussion section to Section assection exercision 4 Forwarding or recommendation also needed Minor REVISION comments 4 4 The paper is generally good but 1 suggest you rectify my few suggests prior publication		Ethical considerations paragraph may be improved to include confidentiality and	
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 knowledge among 9 questions on blood donation? It must be included in the result. 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, Cl. Imiss 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 to section the section of the study approach/methodological considerations also needed Minor REVISION comments Language rewriting needs through Sentence construction needs revision Sentence construction needs revision Optional/General comments The paper is generally good but I suggest you rectify my few suggests prior publication		issues of anonymity.	
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 knowledge among 9 questions on blood donation? It must be included in the result. 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, Cl. 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 to improve rigour. Forwarding or recommendation also needed Minor REVISION comments Language rewriting needs through Sentence construction needs revision Sentence construction needs revision Optional/General comments The paper is generally good but I suggest you rectify my few suggests prior publication		Generally method section needs more work.	
Image: 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, Cl. 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 Language rewriting needs through Sentence construction needs revision Optional/General comments 4 The paper is generally good but I suggest you rectify my few suggests prior publication		\blacksquare In result section what was the response rate? Was it 100% or are all 1153	
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 Language rewriting needs through Sentence construction needs revision Optional/General comments 4 The paper is generally good but I suggest you rectify my few suggests prior publication		participants involved in the study?	
Image: 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, Cl. 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 Language rewriting needs through Sentence construction needs revision Potional/General comments The paper is generally good but I suggest you rectify my few suggests prior publication		How much of study participants do have good knowledge among 9 questions on	
It is better to use chi square to see association between male and female doctors regarding blood donation instead of odds ratio, Cl. 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 Language rewriting needs through Sentence construction needs revision The paper is generally good but I suggest you rectify my few suggests prior publication		blood donation? It must be included in the result.	
Minor REVISION comments 4 Language rewriting needs through Sentence construction needs revision 5 Optional/General comments 4 The paper is generally good but I suggest you rectify my few suggests prior publication		How much of study participants do have good practice.	
I miss a mote thick discussions on ways forward, based on the findings. 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 Language rewriting needs through Sentence construction needs revision Optional/General comments The paper is generally good but I suggest you rectify my few suggests prior publication		4 It is better to use chi square to see association between male and female doctors	
Image: Provide the second s		regarding blood donation instead of odds ratio, CI.	
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 Language rewriting needs through Sentence construction needs revision Optional/General comments The paper is generally good but I suggest you rectify my few suggests prior publication		I miss a mote thick discussions on ways forward, based on the findings.	
improve rigour.The authors need to be include implication of this study at the end of Discussion sectionMinor REVISION commentsLanguage rewriting needs through Sentence construction needs revisionOptional/General commentsImage: Comments <tr< th=""><th></th><th>The authors may want to write briefly about limitations and straight of their study</th><th></th></tr<>		The authors may want to write briefly about limitations and straight of their study	
Image: A The authors need to be include implication of this study at the end of Discussion section Image: Forwarding or recommendation also needed Image: REVISION comments Image: Language rewriting needs through Image: Sentence construction needs revision Image: Optional/General comments Image: Comments		approach/methodological considerations at the end of the Discussion section to	
section Forwarding or recommendation also needed Minor REVISION comments Language rewriting needs through Sentence construction needs revision Sentence construction needs revision Optional/General comments The paper is generally good but I suggest you rectify my few suggests prior publication		improve rigour.	
Minor REVISION comments Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Optional/General comments Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs through Image rewriting needs t		The authors need to be include implication of this study at the end of Discussion	
Minor REVISION comments Language rewriting needs through Sentence construction needs revision Optional/General comments The paper is generally good but I suggest you rectify my few suggests prior publication 		section	
• Language rewriting needs through • Sentence construction needs revision Optional/General comments • The paper is generally good but I suggest you rectify my few suggests prior publication		Forwarding or recommendation also needed	
• Language rewriting needs through • Sentence construction needs revision Optional/General comments • The paper is generally good but I suggest you rectify my few suggests prior publication			
Optional/General comments Sentence construction needs revision The paper is generally good but I suggest you rectify my few suggests prior publication 	Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments Image: Provide the system Image: Provide the system Image: Provide the sy			
The paper is generally good but I suggest you rectify my few suggests prior publication			
The paper is generally good but I suggest you rectify my few suggests prior publication	Optional/General comments		
		igstarrow The paper is generally good but I suggest you rectify my few suggests prior	
The authors need more work on method section		publication	
		The authors need more work on method section	

PART 2:

		Author's comment (if agre highlight that part in the mai 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:	Nigus Kassie
Department, University & Country	Dire Dawa University, Ethiopia

reed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and nanuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write