

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_97057
Title of the Manuscript:	Knowledge, attitude, and practice of blood donation among undergraduate students in Enugu, Nigeria – A cross-sectional 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:

(<https://www.journalajmah.com/index.php/AJMAH/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>After reading and analyzing the article entitled "Knowledge, attitude, and practice of blood donation among undergraduate students in Enugu, Nigeria – A cross-sectional study" we present the following opinion: Specific Comments: The title does not seem compatible with the objectives (factors associated with blood donation practice). Please explain why knowledge and attitude not included in the final analysis ? The abstract is is rather deficient. Important informations were missed, especially in methodology part. The date of data collection, sample size calculation and data colleition technique was not mentioned. In addition, it is suggested to give a brief explanation about the cut-off for knowlwege, attitude and practices. The main findings of the study should focus on the logistic regression output and not descriptive output. Regarding the item "Introduction", it is not presented in a proper way and suggested to presented from the general to the specific, such as relationship between KAP with blood donation in other studies. The methodology is not well designed and there are some points need to be discussed. The Study setting: No need to explain about the Enugu in detailed (the study interest is the ESUT). The author should explain and give justification why the study sample can be divided into strata: 5, 4, 3, and 2 strata ? The instrument of the study is not well explain and many not important points were highlighted instead of the important such as the cut-off for KAP. Regarding the statistical analysis, please explain why no logistic regression explain in this section? Regarding the item "Results", the figure 1 is not important as the study is on KAP in blood donation. Since we do not have a cut-off for knowledge, attitude and practices, it is difficult to understand the explanation for Table 2 and 3. Regarding to logistic regression analyses in Table 4, the author should analyse the data by including the crude OR result follow by aOR. (the reviewer think it's not possible to conduct the logistic regression baseb on the size of samples (too small)). Regarding the item "Discussion", the authors should summarised the finding of knowledge, attitude and practices in the result section before each variable can be discuss further. In addition, the author should focus on the final analysis (LRA) and not discuss about the general findings. The conclusions should based on the aOR findings.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	No, should be review for language	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript is not well written and needs to be revised.	

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lim Kuang Kuay
Department, University & Country	National Institutes of Health, Malaysia