



SDI Review Form 1.6

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
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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	Generally, references number within the body of the manuscript should be enclosed in brackets [] and not parenthesis (). 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. There should be a table showing the demographic characteristics of the participants. The discussion is too lengthy. It should be reasonably shortened without losing its robustness. Stakeholders who contributed towards the success of the research should be dully acknowledged, except if there is none.	
Minor REVISION comments	Line 3: The word, "occurance" should be corrected to "occurrence". Line 8: The word, "availability" should be corrected to "available". Line 10: The phrase, "resource=limited setting", should be properly written as "resource-limited setting". Line 26: "of" should be inserted between proportion and FP. Line 33: "Safety and blood availability", should be written as, "blood safety and availability". Line 39: "Transfusion-transmissible=HIV" should be written as "Transfusion-transmissible-HIV". Remove semi-colon (;) after Nigeria. Line 40: The heading should be numbered as 1. Introduction Line 54: References number should be enclosed in a single bracket [2, 3]. Line 96: Definition of false positive result should be revisited. Reviewer thinks that 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 122: should be numbered as 2. Methodology. There should also be subtopics such as 2.1 Study Area, 2.2 Study Design, 2.3 Study Population, 2.4 Sample size etc. Line 157: should be numbered as 3. Results Line 162: should be numbered as 4. Discussion Line 176: The initial of the Author, Mbaya, "D" should be deleted.	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	Line 183. There should be a full stop after ELISA Line 183-184: 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 187: References number should be enclosed in a single bracket as [14-20]. Line 190: What is procuress? I think Authors mean “procedures” Line 190: Please rephrase “our findings are high” as “it was found to be high in our present study”. Line 191: modifies as follows, “Previous studies in different parts of Africa have reported high false negative test results”. Line 224: References number should be enclosed in a single bracket as [23. 24]. Line 229: “to” should be inserted between “due” and “factors” Line 277: References number should be enclosed in a single bracket as [26. 27]. Line 353: should be numbered as 4. Conclusion Line 355: “in” appears twice. Please delete one Ethical Issue- Authors should declare whether or not that written informed consent was obtained from the Participants. Ethical approval committee’s name and ethical approval registration number should be provided if available.	
Optional/General comments	This is a nice work and the findings are worth-sharing with the scientific community after making the necessary corrections.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Enitan Seyi Samson
Department, University & Country	Department of Medical Laboratory Science, Babcock University, Nigeria