

ReviewForm3

JournalName:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_IJR2H_124134
Titleof theManuscript:	COMPARATIVEANALYSISOFHAEMATOLOGICALPARAMETERS,CD4 ANDCD41COUNTSAMONGTHREECATEGORIESOFBLOODDONORSIN IBADAN, NIGERIA
Typeof the Article	

PART1: ReviewComments

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)
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.	This manuscript provides valuable insights into the hematological and immunological differences among different categories of blood donors, which is crucial for improving blood donation safety and donor recruitment strategies. The comparative analysis of haematological parameters and CD4/CD41 counts can help inform policies aimed at reducing risks associated with commercial blood donations and enhancing the safety of transfusions. However, while the study addresses an important issue, the findings on CD4/CD41 counts lack significant differences, which could weaken the manuscript's impact. Overall, the work contributes to the ongoing discussion on donor safety in developing countries like Nigeria.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	May not be entirely suitable, as it implies a significant focus on the analysis of CD4 and CD41 counts. However, the abstract indicates that no significant differences were found in these parameters. Suggested changes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ If CD4 and CD41 counts are not the key focus of the study or if their analysis did not yield significant findings, it would be better to either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Exclude CD4 and CD41 from the title to prevent confusion. o Include them but clarify that the study explores their trends, even if the results are not statistically significant. Here's a possible revision: "Comparative Analysis of Haematological Parameters Among Three Categories of Blood Donors in Ibadan, Nigeria" This title focuses on the haematological parameters and reflects the significant findings reported in the abstract. If CD4 and CD41 are still a part of the study but not the main focus, they can be mentioned within the study but not highlighted in the title.	
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.	The abstract provides useful insights into the study's aims and findings, but there are several areas that need improvement for clarity and structure. First, the mention of CD4 and CD41 counts in the title suggests a significant focus on these parameters, but the abstract reports no significant differences, which may mislead readers. The phrasing in some parts is also vague, such as the 'decrease in values' without specifying whether these decreases are clinically relevant. Additionally, the conclusion could be strengthened by providing clearer	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Ok	
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-	The title suggests a comparative analysis of CD4 and CD41 counts, but the manuscript does not provide any significant analysis related to these parameters. I recommend either including a detailed analysis of CD4 and CD41 counts or revising the title to better reflect the actual content and focus of the study.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	While the manuscript covers relevant topics, the majority of the references are from 2015 or earlier. To strengthen the paper, I recommend updating the references to include more recent studies and data, ideally from the past five years, to reflect the current state of research in this area.	

ReviewForm3

<p>Minor/REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the articles suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The quality of the English language needs significant improvement. There are numerous, awkward phrasing and unclear expressions throughout the text, which affect the readability and clarity of the paper. I recommend that the authors revise the manuscript thoroughly, preferably with the assistance of a native English speaker or a professional editing service, to enhance the flow, precision, and overall quality of the language.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Clarity and Organization: The manuscript provides a comprehensive comparison of blood donors across different categories, but some sections, especially the methodology, could benefit from clearer and more detailed explanations. Ensuring that all steps of the methodology are explicitly described will enhance the reproducibility of the study.</p> <p>Title and Abstract Alignment: The title suggests a focus on CD4 and CD41 counts, but the abstract indicates that these parameters did not show significant differences. It may be beneficial to revise the title to better reflect the main findings of the study or to emphasize the lack of significant results in CD4 and CD41 counts.</p> <p>Statistical Analysis: The statistical methods used are appropriate, but the manuscript could benefit from a more detailed explanation of how the statistical analyses were conducted. Clarifying the rationale behind choosing specific statistical tests and their implications for the results would strengthen the manuscript.</p> <p>Interpretation of Results: The results section provides valuable data, but the interpretation could be expanded to discuss potential clinical implications more thoroughly. Highlighting how the findings might impact blood donation policies and practices in Nigeria would add depth to the discussion.</p> <p>Literature Review: While the introduction sets a solid foundation, incorporating a more recent review of relevant literature could provide additional context for the study. This would help situate the research within the current landscape of blood donor safety and practices.</p> <p>Based on the information provided, there is no direct mention of competing interests in the manuscript.</p> <p>However, here are some points to consider to determine if there might be competing interests:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Funding Sources: Check if the manuscript discloses any funding sources or financial support received for the study. If the research was funded by organizations with a vested interest in the outcomes, this could be considered a competing interest. Affiliations and Relationships: Look at the affiliations of the authors and any potential relationships with commercial entities or organizations involved in blood donation or transfusion. Any direct or indirect relationships that might influence the study's design, conduct, or interpretation should be disclosed. Conflict of Interest Statements: Ensure that the manuscript includes a statement regarding conflicts of interest, typically found in the acknowledgments or at the end of the discussion. Authors should declare any personal or professional interests that could be perceived to influence the study. Bias and Objectivity: Assess whether the study's design, analysis, or conclusions could be 	

PART 2:

	<p>Reviewer's comment</p>	<p>Author's comment (if agreed with the 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><u>No</u></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Sheikh Anisul Haque</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>Khwaja Yunus Ali Medical College and Hospital, Bangladesh</p>