

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJR2H_125802
Title of the Manuscript:	Seroprevalence of Viral Markers among Tattooed and Non-Tattooed Prospective Blood Donors at Lagos University Teaching Hospital (LUTH)
Type of the Article	Original 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 '**lack of Novelty**', 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

<b>Compulsory</b> 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 feedback here)</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 novel. The study has sufficient scientific vigor. There is not enough literature on this, and hence will be beneficial for the scientific community.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	Abstract is comprehensive	
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.	Adequate sample size Results are clear Discussion is apt	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Nil	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	Exclusion criteria is the mirror of inclusion. Needs to be modified Table 1 sections a and b can be side to side merged in the same table for easy understanding <b>Effect of Tattoo Status on Packed Cell Volume section is irrelevant, should be deleted or justified</b>	

#### 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:	Abhishekh B
Department, University & Country	Jawaharlal Institute of Postgraduate Medical Education and Research, India