Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_IJR2H_46529**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Knowledge And Attitude Towards Premarital Sickle Cell Disease Screening Among Students Attending Federal College of Education, Kano, Nigeria**
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	General comments This paper has meritorious findings and it could be published. However, there are numerous problems. First of all, English has to be reviewed by a native English-speaking professional, and the entire paper needs to be rewritten. Many sentences are too long, and the meanings are unclear. There are specific deficiencies I listed below that need to be corrected or answered. Below is a list of specific points that need authors' attention. Abstract Results in abstract, explain the following sentence, "although up to 9.1% selected blood group as their genotype". Does it mean that some thought ABO blood group was a sickle cell genotype? Next sentence, "Predictors of knowledge from the study are programme of study, religion and age which was seen a significant relationship between knowledge of premarital sickle cell screening and the variables with p-value < 0.05 while those predictors for attitude towards premarital sickle cell screening include religion, knowledge of sickle cell disease and marital status p-value < 0.05 as indicated in the results." This sentence is too long, and its meaning is unclear. Should be separated in a few sentences with clear message in each sentence. 2.1 Sample collection Needs more details in selection of subjects? How the authors approached potential subjects? What criteria were used for selection? Was it a consecutive sampling? Do the subjects represent general student population at large at that college? Describe inclusion and exclusion criteria. Please explain "different programmes (Pre-NCE, NCE, B. Ed and PGDE) , what these abbreviations mean? Does each stand for a department? The instrument used, "the questionnaire", was it validated to extract necessary information? If so where was it published? Please affix the sample questionnaire at the end of the article as an appendix. Line 3, authors state "patients", but I assume they are students, not patients. Results Please define what authors mean by "positive" or "negative" attitude. What questions were asked to reflect subjects' attitude? Also define "high level knowledge" and "low level knowledge" All tables should include percentage in each cell, so that the discussion of the results can be easily understood by looking at the tables. Line 151-153. That table indicates that there is a positive correlation between High knowledge and Positive attitude, and conversely negative attitude and low knowledge. I assume that p value was based on chi square analysis. The entire result section should be rewritten since the current writing is awkward, and at times does not make sense. Discussion Line 165, "Most of the respondents who have heard of genetic disease knew the cause. However, a reasonable proportion demonstrated a poor knowledge about the cause of genetic diseases". This sentence is unclear in its meaning. Next sentence, "Most of the respondents demonstrated poor knowledge on premarital sickle cell screening. However, reasonable proportions of the respondents have higher levels of knowledge on premarital sickle cell screening" does not make sense either. It should be rewritten. Line 206, (At 5% significant level). This is incorrect. This is at probability of 95%.	The sentences were corrected as suggested The sentences were corrected as suggested The abbreviations were defined We presume that a sample of questionnaire should not be included in any scientific article. So, a separate attachment of questionnaire was supplemented for editorial considerations. Corrected as suggested Done Done Corrected and rephrased Corrected as suggested

	Conclusion Line 212, for non-adherence. What does it mean? Nonadherence to what? Line 218. these recommendations were recommended, this sentence should be changed to "**these recommendations could be made"**	Rephrased Rephrased
Minor REVISION comments		
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)*	