

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_106814
Title of the Manuscript:	Determining the genotype of the RH blood group system in Maltese blood donors
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I consider it important, since it provides different contributions in the scientific area to determine the RH factor when taking into account donors and how the region where the donor lives, their employment, among other characteristics, is also decisive. 2. The title adapts to the needs of the author. 3. It is a clear summary that covers what is necessary to have prior knowledge of the investigation. 4. The structure presented in the document is consistent with what we wish to contribute to science. 5. It covers important aspects of the area of blood donation, which is a bit complex due to all the processes and rigid controls that must be carried out. Studying the RH factor in this way and with it determining the benefit at the time of a blood transfusion is vital for the same life process of the person who receives it. 6. You should make more up-to-date bibliographic contributions, that is, from the last 5 years onwards (2018-2023), it is important to have old references (more than 10, 15, 40 years old), but it is about focusing on more recent contributions. modern and current in these years. The general conditions of an individual from 40, 20, 15 years ago are not the same as those of a person today (approximately the last 5 years). You should delve deeper into this and add perhaps 5 more up-to-date references. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	It is adequate, precise and clear.	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 1.7

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i> It is a research in the area of health where ethical criteria are handled due to dealing with human beings, however, each of these aspects has been respected and managed.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Leonor Mariana Duque Fernandez
Department, University & Country	Instituto Superior De Formacion Docente Salome, Colombia