

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Hematology Research Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AHRJ_127080
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Determination of the reference ranges and numerical ratios of Total Plasma Protein and Hemoglobin concentration among apparently healthy prospective blood donors in Calabar Municipality, Cross Rivers State, Nigeria : A comparative study using three Hemoglobinometers.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript offers valuable insights into the reference ranges and numerical ratios of Total Plasma Protein (TPP) and Hemoglobin (Hb) concentration among healthy blood donors, an area essential for improving blood donor screening and eligibility assessment. The comparative analysis using three hemoglobinometry methods addresses practical challenges in blood donation, especially in settings with limited resources. Such research can help refine criteria for blood donor qualification, ultimately contributing to more accurate screening processes and safer blood transfusion practices.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	The title accurately reflects the content of the manuscript. However, a more concise version such as "Reference Ranges and Ratios of Total Plasma Protein and Hemoglobin in Prospective Blood Donors: A Comparative Hemoglobinometry Study in Calabar, Nigeria" could improve readability.	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	The abstract is mostly comprehensive, but it could be improved by briefly mentioning the key finding of statistical insignificance between gender differences ( $p > 0.05$ ). Additionally, stating the implications of the findings at the end would enhance the abstract's clarity for readers.	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	The manuscript's subsections and structure are logical and well-organized, facilitating a clear presentation of methodology, results, and conclusions.	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This study appears scientifically robust, using a cross-sectional design with random sampling and rigorous hemoglobinometric methods. The manuscript is technically sound, with detailed statistical analyses supporting the findings. The use of multiple hemoglobinometry methods strengthens the reliability and relevance of the study's conclusions, providing a comprehensive evaluation of TPP and Hb reference ranges among blood donors.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> :	The references are adequate and relatively recent. However, it could benefit from more recent sources (2022-2024) regarding blood donor screening practices, if available, to further support the study's relevance to current clinical guidelines.	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	The language quality is mostly suitable for scholarly communication, though minor grammatical corrections and stylistic adjustments would improve clarity and readability. For example, rephrasing lengthy sentences in the methodology section could enhance comprehension.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	The study's design and findings are well-presented and contribute valuable data to the field of hematology and transfusion medicine. It would be useful if the authors could discuss possible limitations related to the sample size and generalizability of the findings beyond the study region.  No competing interests were identified based on the information provided. <i>No ethical issues were identified. The manuscript includes details on ethical approval and informed consent, aligning with standard research practices for studies involving human participants.</i>	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Desi Sarli</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Alifah University, Indonesia</b>