



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Archives of Current Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ACRI_41831
Title of the Manuscript:	SERO-EPIDEMIOLOGY OF TRANSFUSION TRANSMISSIBLE INFECTIONS (TTIs) AMONGST VOLUNTARY BLOOD DONORS IN ERINGETI, DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO (D.R.C).
Type of the Article	original research paper

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	➤ The topic should be shortened and made more concise. ➤ Abstract also needs to be reviewed in its entirety such that, the aims, objectives, methods of investigations, findings and conclusions of this study will be adequately representative. ➤ The introduction should generally be restructured and made shorter. ➤ The result table for TTIs is faulty and has affected most of the work in this study. ➤ The conclusion should be restructured to be made more representative.	Thank you very much for your suggestion. What you are saying about our article is very important because our article must be perfect. We just have done all our best to correct it regarding your suggestions and remarks.
Minor REVISION comments	• Line 1-3; could be captured as " sero-epidemiology of transfusion transmissible infections amongst voluntary blood donors in Eringeti, Democratic Republic of the Congo. (DCR) • Lines 5-6 needs to be rephrased to convey the meaning it deserves. • Lines 7-9; the objective in my view is "to assess the sero-epidemiology of transfusion transmissible infections in voluntary blood donors at the Health center of Reference, Eringeti-DCR. • Lines 11-21 needs to be restructured appropriately. • Lines 22-28: should be more concise and reflecting findings in this study. You may adopt "Health center of Reference" rather than "Reference Health center" • Line 38 add 's' after 90. • Line 42 'in' between 'performed' and 'the' should be replaced with "and" • Line 45 replace 'and' between 'lethal' and 'could' with "but". • Line 47 delayed complications of transfusion also includes TTIs so you may rephrase appropriately. • Lines 53-55 needs to be restructured. What is PBMH in full? • Lines 56-59 should be restructured. HTLV and Chagas disease should be written correctly. • Line 60-61 research works in Africa are not few. They may be few in DRC. You may rephrase as "..... Research works in Africa are often limited to local initiatives.....which hardly represent generalized conclusions for the region" • Lines 62-66 needs to be restructured. Use simple expressions to convey your information where necessary. • Line 67 blood safety is "assured" instead of "ensured" • Lines 67-71 should be restructured. • Line 72 what is the full meaning of CNTS? • Lines 75-should be rephrased. • Lines 92-93 why repeat HBV and HCV? • Lines 94-97 blood transfusion is also a medical therapy. You need to restructure this statement to convey the required information. • Lines 98-99 restructure this statement. • Lines 102-105 your objective is not clear; please rephrase as appropriate. • Lines 113-115; are these the only items used in blood transfusion practice in this centre? You may complete the list please. • Line 117 should be restructured " this was a cross-sectional retrospective study" • Lines 119-122 needs to be restructured using medical terminologies. • Lines 124-126 should be rephrased and shortened. • Lines 127-131 needs a complete overhaul. Is the test ELISA based or not? Describe the methodology more detailed.	-The items used in blood transfusion practice in this center are only that. The center is in the rural area without equipment. -The test ELIZA doesn't exist in this center. We haven't laboratory equipment. - Regarding the table of Transfusion Transmissible Infections found, the cases of syphilis was 50 not 53. We just correct. Thank you. - in general, we already correct this paper by follow all your view of point. We have done all our best.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	• Lines 132-136 needs to be restructured. Indicate if ethical clearance for the study was obtained from the institution or ethics board? • Lines 138-141 should be rephrased. • Line 148 use “voluntary” rather than “volunteer”. You may adopt this in all areas as required in this paper. • Line 155 the table is not correct; the total number of single infections are 39 but in combination with the combined infections it goes up to 142. Your calculations are seemingly incorrect. • Lines 163-189 needs to be restructured all together. • Line 190 the number “59” should be written as “Fifty nine” since it is the beginning of a sentence. • Lines 191- 193 should be rephrased. • Lines 194 “ITT” should be replaced with “TTI” • Lines 193-209 should be restructured. • Lines 209-213 could be restructured; observe the use of capital letters only in appropriate places. • Lines 214-217 what is the relationship between HTLV and your study? It may be excluded. • Line 224 does not convey the meaning it desires. • Lines 226-238 need to be restructured. • Lines 238-241 appear inappropriate at this stage of your write up. • Line 243 “communicable” is inappropriate, it is “transfusion transmissible” • Lines 243-256 is too long. Could be shortened and restructured to give a more concise conclusion. • Lines 259 and above: the referencing is not systematic and orderly as seen in 2,4,6,8,14,16-20,22 and 26.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The concept is good but the delivery needs to be improved upon for an effective dissemination of research findings in the scientific world.	Thank you very much for your remarks and your view point. We have already done all our best to correct regarding your remarks. Thanks a lot.