

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_116893
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Blood Transfusion Request Form: The Experience in a Tertiary Health Facility in Jos, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	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>
<p><u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>The manuscript addresses an important topic in healthcare, specifically the completeness and accuracy of blood transfusion request forms. Ensuring the appropriate documentation on these forms is crucial for patient safety and effective blood transfusion processes. By evaluating the completeness of such forms in a tertiary health center in Nigeria, the manuscript sheds light on potential deficiencies in clinical practice and highlights areas for improvement. However, the manuscript may have some areas for improvement in terms of clarity, transparency, and ethical considerations, its focus on an important healthcare issue and potential implications for clinical practice, patient safety, research, and policy make it relevant and potentially valuable for the scientific community.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes, the abstract provides a clear overview of the study's background, aims, design, methodology, results, and conclusion. It effectively communicates the importance of appropriate documentation on blood transfusion request forms and highlights areas of compliance and non-compliance among clinicians. The keywords provided help identify the main focus of the study. Overall, it seems comprehensive and well-structured.</p> <p>The manuscript follows an appropriate structure with clearly defined subsections, there is room for improvement in terms of clarity, organization, and detail in certain sections. Refining the structure and ensuring coherence between subsections would enhance the overall readability and impact of the manuscript.</p> <p>The manuscript appears to be scientifically sound based on the information provided, additional details on methodology, data analysis, interpretation of results, and ethical considerations would further strengthen the scientific accuracy and credibility of the study.</p> <p>Yes</p>	
<p><u>Minor</u> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Clarity of Purpose: The introduction sets the stage for discussing the importance of proper documentation on transfusion request forms, but it could benefit from a clearer statement of purpose or objective. What specific aspect of documentation or problem are you aiming to address with this study?</p> <p>Literature Review Integration: The introduction could be strengthened by more effectively integrating existing literature and studies related to incomplete documentation on transfusion request forms. This could help provide context for the current study and demonstrate its relevance in the broader medical field.</p> <p>Transition to Methods: The transition from the introduction to the methods section could be smoother. Consider explicitly stating how the study aims to address the issues outlined in the introduction, thereby providing a clearer link between the introduction and the methodology.</p> <p>Regarding the content of your discussion:</p> <p>Data Interpretation: The discussion provides a detailed analysis of the data collected, which is commendable. However, it could be further enhanced by providing more interpretation of the findings. For example, why do you think certain variables (such as age or clinical diagnosis) were documented more frequently than others?</p> <p>Comparison with Previous Studies: While you mention some previous studies, there could be a more comprehensive comparison with existing literature. How do your findings align with or differ from those of previous studies? What insights can be gained from comparing the results?</p> <p>Implications and Recommendations: The discussion touches on the implications of incomplete documentation for blood transfusion processes, but it could be strengthened by discussing potential consequences in more detail. Additionally, the recommendations provided could be expanded upon to include specific actions that healthcare institutions or policymakers can take to address the identified issues.</p> <p>In General, your discussion effectively addresses the significance of proper documentation on transfusion request forms, but further development and integration of existing literature could enhance its impact and relevance.</p>	
---	--	--

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Jane Acquaye</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Ghana</p>