SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

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 Article:	**Original Research Article**

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper **(if any)**	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
Knowledge and attitude in premarital screening for sickle cell disease In the abstract, define "low knowledge" and "negative attitude" Although the result section in the abstract has improved, still there are problems in syntax. I might suggest the paragraph shown below instead of the current paragraph. *Forty-six percent of respondents had low knowledge of sickle cell disease as defined by -------, and 40 percent had negative attitude towards premarital sickle cell screening as defined by -------. The predictors of knowledge are programme of study in which students are enrolled, religion and age (each p<0.05), while those predictors for attitude towards premarital sickle cell screening include religion, knowledge of sickle cell disease and marital status, each at P < 0.05.* Line 58, How was this validated? Please describe in detail, the method of validation using pretest and posttest. What was the intra-subject variability? Line 61, Change this phrase, who are both married and unmarried → to **who are either married or single** Sampling is "convenient samples" Line 68 and on, it appears that all students who volunteered are in the department of education, aiming to be teachers. Is it correct? If that is the case, it should be clearly stated, since this is a small specialized subset of students, and the results are unlikely applicable to general population. Line 79, p=prevalence from the initial study, What prevalence does it refer to? I am unable to obtain this article referenced as 6 Line 87, Hemoglobin electrophoresis is not a hemoglobin gene genotyping. It appears that the authors are describing the standard method for cellulose acetate electrophoresis. If that is the case, there is no need to describe it in detail, since it is routinely used. Line 107 and beyond. Why the cut off point of 2.5? If the max score for each item is 4, and if 1 or 2 is rated poor, and 3 or 4 rated good, the cut off point should be 2. Line 126 and beyond, this paragraph, extremely verbose. This paragraph can be shortened such as. "*A total of 305 students (41% male) responded. Age distribution of the respondents is shown in Table 1. The highest response was in the age group 21-25 (32.5%), and the lowest, 46 years and older (4.9%). Sixty-nine percent were Muslims (Islamic Religion), and 31% Christians (Table1)*". Line 138, again this is grammatically wrong and awkward sentence. The paper is full of these sentences, and all of them should be revised. "Higher percentage of female students having more knowledge and attitude greater than that of the male students was recorded." It should say, "*More female students had greater knowledge and more positive attitude than male students.*" Throughout the paper, the authors used the term "unmarried". I would prefer the term "single" to "unmarried. Line 175- 179 and Table 5, "p=0.109 (x square) seems to refer to the row corresponding to "B Ed" **in knowledge assessment**, Yet the text on line 179 states, "The attitude of the respondents shows that PGDE students are the only group with **positive attitude** 50.0% towards premarital sickle cell screening while all the other group of students in other programme of studies have negative **attitude** toward premarital sickle cell screening as follows NCE (45.3%), Pre-NCE (30.0%), and B. Ed (38.9%) with statistical significance (P = 0.109). What does this p value refer to? Line 186, legend for Table 5, P of <0.05, this is comparison between what and what? Line 207-209. I disagree with authors's statement, "[therefore is significant difference between knowledge of premarital sickle cell screening and attitude towards premarital screening (Table 7)]. I note that *there is a statistically significant positive correlation between high level knowledge and positive attitude. Conversely, there is a significant correlation between low level knowledge and negative attitude.* *Line 235-237,* This sentence, again does not make sense. What is the difference between "most" and "reasonable number"?; "**Most** of	

| the students demonstrated poor knowledge on premarital sickle cell screening. However, **reasonable proportions** of the students have higher levels of knowledge on premarital sickle cell screening". Authors should state actual number such as "-% of students had knowledge level of 3 or 4, whereas - % had poor knowledge level 1 or 2."
 Line 263, again $p<0.05$ refers to what?
 Line 282, the term" reasonable" should be replaced with some other term that is more objective.
 Line 297, again hemoglobin electrophoresis is not hemoglobin gene genotyping.
 At the end of discussion, please describe limitations of the paper and strengths of the paper. | |

Reviewer Details:

Name:	*Susumu Inoue*
Department, University & Country	*Michigan State University, USA*