

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_98719
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation Of The Compliance Of Biological Examination Requests At The General Hospital Of Douala
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:

(<https://journaljabb.com/index.php/JABB/editorial-policy>)

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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	1. The manuscript is important for scientific community this is because it is bringing out a very key component in the quality of laboratory process in the preanalytical phase where a correct and accurate filling of the forms leads to correct patients offered the service, the right sample taken and results submission to the right clinician. 2. The title of the article is suitable however it requires modification to avoid repetition of the word (OF). It can be modified to reach (Evaluation of the compliance of biological examination requests at the general Hospital, Douala) 3. some information needs to be added such as how the forms were sampled, sample size, the study design here can best be described as descriptive cross sectional study design. The objectives need to come out very clearly in the background. The conclusion should be in line with the results highlighting the primary home message, additional findings and the perspective of the researcher. 4. the subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate 5. it is correct and relevant and will add a lot of insight in clinical laboratory interphase to improve quality of services offered to patients. 6. references sufficient and good recent,	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, simple and clear	
Optional/General comments	The paper is generally good and would have value in medical laboratory medicine	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Celline Atieno Okuta
Department, University & Country	Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology, Kenya