

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_77730
Title of the Manuscript:	Occurrence of hepatitis B, C, and HIV among blood donors at different hospitals of Lahore, Pakistan
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	<p>A line 'Shaving from community barbers is to be avoided' is mentioned in the abstract. Addition of further data to support this statement in the form of p-values, tabulation will be required.</p> <p>Also, suggested to add few tabulations and/or graphs of the results.</p> <p>'Since 1930 blood has been used for various disease indications.' - kindly cite this line. History of use of blood for transfusion purposes has been documented well before 1930.</p> <p>Suggested grammar improvement - pronouns seem misplaced and some sentences seem incomplete.</p> <p>Kindly explain terms such as 'common pin in teeth', or replace with terms that non-regional audience can understand.</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>"....less than 18 years, pregnant women, and weighing's than 50 kg, were exclusive of sampling" this line sounds redundant as it is already mentioned that eligible blood donors were included in the study. Excluded samples should be a subset of the included samples and not mutually exclusive.</p> <p>Literature review paragraphs would be easier to read if it goes by a pattern, e.g., introduction (along with burden on healthcare systems, aetiological organisms, modes of spread for each (along with similarities and differences, if any), pathogenesis and morphology (and their affect on organ systems), clinical features and prevention. After this will come the rationale of the study (which is placed appropriately in the manuscript).</p> <p>In discussion, phrases like 'findings carried out by are better than our study results', 'results of our study are better than the study conducted by ...' etc., can be avoided.</p> <p>Also, consider using uniform tense and voice rules in discussion part.</p> <p>Kindly use better keywords that will lead the audience to your article while searching the databases.</p>	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>I come to understand that in patients, factors like extramarital relation, shaving from barber, sharing nail clippers and tattooing were concluded to be a risk for transmission of the mentioned blood-borne viruses through the answers from the questionnaire. How was recall bias addressed for in the study? For example, a donor who tested positive for HCV might have failed to recall an IV injection/tattooing and might have only ticked nail-clipper sharing in the questionnaire.</p> <p>Paraphrasing of the title is suggested.</p>	

Review Form 1.6

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:	Naveenvairamoorthy Dakshinamoorthy
Department, University & Country	ESI Postgraduate Institute of Medical Science and Research, India