

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJR2H_126902
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Serological Markers and Real –Time PCR of HBV-DNA among Blood Donors with HBsAg Negative in Ilorin, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>I appreciate this manuscript for its contribution to understanding the complexities of HBV diagnostics and its implications for blood donation safety. It emphasizes the importance of utilizing advanced detection methods, such as real-time PCR, to uncover hidden infections that standard serological tests may miss. This approach not only enhances our knowledge of HBV epidemiology in Nigeria but also encourages a reevaluation of current screening strategies, which is vital for effective disease management and prevention. This research can inform public health policies and improve blood safety, ultimately reducing the risk of HBV transmission through transfusions.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title is not appropriate.            "Detection of HBV-DNA and Serological Markers in HBsAg-Negative Blood Donors: A Study from Ilorin, Nigeria"</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Abstract: The scientific rigor of this manuscript is lacking and contains several inaccuracies. For instance, while the article's title references PCR, the conclusion suggests that this technique should be employed to explore latent infections, indicating a disconnect in the narrative. The text requires revision and should be made more original in its writing style. What specific strategies were employed? Given the numerous seromolecular studies available, what innovative contributions does this work offer? The methodology should be presented clearly and concisely. Additionally, the types of factors included in the questionnaire should be briefly outlined, and if any of these are significant findings, they should be highlighted in the results section. What statistical methods were utilized in the analysis? Which type of Real-time PCR. Do not use the term RT-PCR for Real-time PCR because they are two separate techniques. The results of the work are not well presented and should be rewritten. What is meant by rapid RDT tests? Is a special test other than PCR used to identify virus DNA? Mention the name of the test. What was ELISA kit type? From which country? The lowest measurable concentration? What was the sensitivity and specificity of the kit? Are these serological kits capable of identifying mutant strains in terms of HBsAg? Correct keywords.</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>The section of manuscript is correct</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>The combination of a relevant research question, rigorous methodology, and potential public health impact underscores the scientific robustness and technical soundness of this manuscript.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The number of references is adequate; however, it would be beneficial to include all relevant references from 2023 and 2024, if possible.</p>	

### Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<b>The manuscript lacks strength in terms of English structure and fluency.</b>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<b>The manuscript should be scientifically edited</b>	

### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<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>Bahman Aghcheli</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Gonabad University of Medical Sciences, Iran</b>