

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_123775
Title of the Manuscript:	Frequency of ABO, Rh and Kell Blood Group among Blood Donors in Brazzaville, Republic of the Congo
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<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>1. Importance of Manuscript:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reviewer's Comment: The manuscript addresses an important aspect of blood group distribution, which is crucial for blood transfusion services and epidemiological studies in the Republic of the Congo. Understanding the frequency of blood groups can aid in improving blood bank management and ensuring adequate blood supplies. The study's relevance to local public health and transfusion practices adds significant value to the scientific community. 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>1. Title Suitability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reviewer's Comment: The title of the manuscript is suitable as it clearly describes the focus of the study. No alternative title is necessary. 	
<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>1. Abstract Comprehensiveness:</p> <p>Reviewer's Comment: The abstract provides a brief overview of the study but could benefit from including more details on the methodology and key findings. Adding information on the sample size, study design, and significant results would make the abstract more comprehensive</p>	
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>	<p>1. Subsections and Structure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reviewer's Comment: The structure and subsections of the manuscript are appropriate. The organization follows a logical flow, including an introduction, methods, results, and discussion. <p>2. Scientific Correctness:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reviewer's Comment: The manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. The study is well-designed, with a clear methodology for blood group determination. The results are presented with statistical analysis, and the conclusions are supported by the data. The study adds valuable information about blood group frequencies in a specific region, which can be useful for local health services. 	
<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reviewer's Comment: The manuscript presents valuable data and is a significant contribution to the field. After addressing the suggested minor revisions, it should be considered for publication. 	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =</p>	<p>1. References:</p> <p>Reviewer's Comment: The references are generally sufficient and relevant. However, consider including recent studies or reviews on blood group distribution in similar regions to provide a broader context</p>	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Minor Revision Comments: 1. Language/English Quality: <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Reviewer's Comment: The language and English quality of the manuscript are suitable for scholarly communication. However, a thorough proofread may be necessary to improve clarity and fix minor grammatical issues.	
Optional/General comments	Optional/General Comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Reviewer's Comment: Overall, the manuscript is well-prepared and provides valuable insights into blood group distribution. Addressing the minor revisions suggested will enhance the quality of the manuscript.	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Muhammad Kashan Javed
Department, University & Country	Institute of Molecular Biology and Biotechnology, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Pakistan