



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJR2H_43946
Title of the Manuscript:	TREND OF DONOR REJECTION DUE TO THE INCIDENCE OF HEPATITIS B AND C VIRUSES, HUMAN IMMUNODEFIENCY VIRUS (HIV 1&2) AND SYPHILIS IN GHANA: A RETROSPECTIVE STUDY.
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://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. Authors need to address the following: Syphilis should be replaced with Treponema pallidum since it is the causal agent for the disease.</p> <p>Abstract Objectives should reflect manuscript title. State the statistical packages used. Line 17-Disease should be changed to infection. All percentages in parentheses should be round off to one decimal place. Recommend in one statement after conclusion. Keywords: Use only words captured in Manuscript title e.g Ghana, HBV, HIV, T. pallidum, Donor rejection etc. Materials and Methods Describe study area with cited references. Results Present result percentage in one decimal place. Table 1 and 2 can be merged together and title needs to be reframed to suit study objectives. Use black and white to differentiate graphs/figures. Colors not clear. Figure 6 not clear. Find appropriate way of presenting it. Discussion Relate findings with previous studies from other countries other than Ghana. E.g: Africa, Asia and Europe. Conclusion is scanty. Give us your striking findings and recommend in few statements.</p>	<p>In relation to the peer review comments suggested to us (the authors), the following modifications have been made to the manuscript;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Syphilis has been replaced with Treponema pallidum 2. The objectives have been modified to reflect the title 3. The statistical package used has been stated, disease has been replaced with infection, all percentages have been converted to one decimal place and recommendations have been inserted in the abstract 4. Only words found in the title have been used as keywords 5. A description of the study area has been inserted into the materials and methods of the manuscript. 6. Table 1 and 2 have been merged into a single table 7. The findings of this research has be related to previous studies from countries other than Ghana. 8. The conclusion of the research has been modified to include recommendations as was suggested. 9. May be the title of figure 6 in the previous manuscript made it very difficult for one to interpret hence we have modified the title to reflect what we wanted to accomplish with that sketch (to give a general overview of the incidence of each infection as the occurred from 2014-2017). <p>EXEMPTIONS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Though the authors of the manuscript appreciate the reviewers' recommendation of using black and white to differentiate the graphs/figures, we realised that using black and white made the figures very indistinct especially the graph on HBsAg, HCV, HIV and syphilis (due to limit length of the reactive groups). For this reason, the color coding used have been maintained however the resolutions of the images have been improved such that it is now easier to read from them.
Minor REVISION comments	References should be arranged based on Journal guidelines.	The references have been arranged in the order that they appeared in the manuscript.
Optional/General comments	Introduction is well written but few references cited.	All the reference that ought to be provided against their respective statements have been provided.

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	There are no ethical issues in this manuscript (approval was sought before the research was conducted)

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.



SDI Review Form 1.6

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>