

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_126781
Title of the Manuscript:	ABO, KELL AND KELL BLOOD PHENOTYPE AMONG DONATED BLOOD UNITS AT UNIVERSITY COLLEGE HOSPITAL, IBADAN NIGERIA
Type of the Article	Research Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lac k of Nove l ty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her</i>
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.	The study is important to know the prevalence of Kell blood group phenotype prevalence among blood donors of a particular community - as this is Clinically significant and may result in Transfusion Reactions.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Needs Revision - PICO Style needs to be followed	
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.	Can be condensed.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Scientifically requires corrections – Tile method of Blood Grouping can not be examined under a microscope. Repeats can be avoided.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	Can be included recent studies.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Requires improvisation	
Optional/General comments	Requires revision of the article before accepting for publication. Comparative studies in the form of Table needs to be included.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	K V Sreedhara Babu
Department, University & Country	Sri Venkateswara Institute Of Medical Sciences, India