



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

PART 1:

Journal Name:	Asian Hematology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AHRJ_41451
Title of the Manuscript:	A COMPARISON OF TWO HIV ANTIBODY ELISAs WITH A COMBINED ANTIGEN-ANTIBODY ELISA FOR THE OCCURANCE OF FALSE RESULTS IN A HOSPITAL-BASED BLOOD BANK IN NORTH CENTRAL NIGERIA
New title of the Manuscript:	FALSE NEGATIVE TESTING OF TWO HIV ANTIBODY ELISAs IN COMPARISON WITH A COMBINED ANTIGEN-ANTIBODY ELISA IN A HOSPITAL-BASED BLOOD BANK IN NORTH CENTRAL NIGERIA.
Type of Article:	Original Research Article

PART 2:

FINAL EVALUATOR'S comments on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to final evaluator's comments
The reviewer appreciates authors' effort in improving the quality of their manuscript, however, for their manuscript to be accepted for publication pending on the final decision to be taken by the editorial board, some revision is still required in accordance with the Journal format. Some issues raised here, have been raised previously, is just that for whatever reason(s) known only to the authors, they failed to respond to them. It is not mandatory for authors to agree with the reviewer, but it is mandatory for them to provide reasonable explanation for not agreeing with reviewer's comments. <u>Issues at stake:</u> Generally, references number within the body of the manuscript should be enclosed in brackets [] and not parenthesis (). Authors should kindly check published articles for confirmation. Description of the study area should be clearly stated under methodology. Authors should provide the coordinates of the geographical location where the research was carried out. It appears Authors were silent on sample size calculation and contents of the questionnaire that was administered. Such information is important. There should be a table showing the demographic characteristics of the participants. In the Reviewer's opinion, a six (6) page discussion is undesirable (too lengthy). Readers can get bored and miss out the important components. It is important that authors respond to all the above mentioned queries. Line 34: For the purpose of consistency, insert semi-colon (;) after Antibody ELISA Line 49: References number should be separated with a coma and enclosed in a single bracket [2, 3]. Line 87-88: Reviewer insists that the definition of false positive result should be revisited. A false positive test result is "observed where a potential blood donor is screened as being HIV sero-positive when indeed he or she does not have HIV infection as tested with by a gold standard test or method". Line 108: Under methodology, there should be subtopics such as 2.1 Study Area, 2.2 Study Design, 2.3 Study Population, 2.4 Sample size etc according to the journal format. Line 191-193: should read, "These findings show that statistically significant relationship ($p < 0.001$) exists and suggest that these two assays are inefficient in preventing TT-HIV infections when deployed for blood safety interventions in RLS like our hospital-based blood transfusion centre". Line 195: References number should be enclosed in a single bracket as [14-19] according to the Journal format. Line 232: References number should be enclosed in a single bracket as [22, 23]. Line 249: Insert a space between et al and (21) Line 285: References number should be enclosed in a single bracket as [26, 27].	Your review comments are greatly appreciated. Please note the following responses; This formatting of reference numbers () or [] is usually done by the publishers as they edit the work for production of a galley proof in line with particular journal styles. However, on your insistence I have effected that. For a retrospective study my description was sufficient. More so there are word limitations in journals so some of these details may not be necessary. However on your insistence, I have included much of that now. This is a laboratory based study aimed at assessing some quality parameters. The demographic characteristics are not very necessary in this study. Moreover, there is nowhere in the text where emphasis on such is made. The reviewer seem political in condemning the length of our discussion without suggesting areas that do not support the aims and objectives of the paper. Noted and inserted with thanks. Noted Noted. Noted. Noted Noted Noted Noted



SDI FINAL EVALUATION FORM 1.1

Ethical Issue-

CONSENT

Authors should declare whether or not that written informed consent was obtained from the Participants immediately after recommendation (and not within methodology) according to the Journal format.

Noted.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

Authors should provide ethical approval registration number from the named Ethical Committee for this all important study.

Noted

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors should declare that no competing interests exist according to the Journal format.

Noted

Authors should kindly note that adherence to the authors guidelines and journal format, determines whether or not submitted manuscript will be accepted for publication.