



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_28816
Title of the Manuscript:	DETERMINANTS OF ADVERSE TRANSFUSION REACTIONS AT DELTA STATE UNIVERSITY TEACHING HOSPITAL, OGHARA, DELTA STATE, NIGERIA: ANALYSIS OF 46 CASES
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments –	– Add reference for the statement – The first successful human to human blood transfusion was credited to James Bunnell in 1819. – Line 46: Correct spelling of Bunnell – Line 56: <i>The transmission of infectious agents such as HIV, hepatitis, syphilis etc.</i> These are not adverse reactions. – The methodology section is very weak, need to improve it, write about the reaction notification/record form. Is it a nationally accepted form or internally developed only for this hospital. What are the key information. What is the procedure of notification in this hospital, is it manual form or computerized. Is it communicated to the blood banks for investigation? – Ethical approval? – The % is very low for transfusion reaction. Is it because of stringent blood safety protocols in the blood bank and ward or Under Reporting, Discuss this in detail. – The author should reflect the haemovigilance practices in Nigeria in a few lines. – The <i>patient blood management</i> issue to be discussed in Discussion section	Reference added Spelling corrected Rephrased accordingly Methodology modified accordingly Under-reporting is a possibility Highlighted
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments –	– Line 7: replace transfusion with transfusions – Line 11: Replace to having with for – Line 16: Replace 2 with two – Line 19: Use only one full stop – Line 22: Write Tachycardia as tachycardia	Replaced Replaced Replaced Done Corrected Change effected



SDI Review Form 1.6

	– Line 31 : Write Gender as gender – Line 58: Write Haemolytic as haemolytic – Line 107: Replace done with conducted – Rephrase line 118-119 – Rephrase line 155-156 – Line 158: Replace these with this Title of figure 2 is not accurate or what the author intend to explain The authors have to inform in the methodology section about the ethical permission.	Done Replaced Rephrased Rephrased Replaced Packed Red Cells and Whole blood are the components used Unfortunately, we did not apply for ethical permission
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Overall the study is very impressive; the authors have done a good job in gathering the data on this topic and comparing with the regional data, such studies are very important to highlight the reactions which are often under repored. Haemovigilance is very crucial for blood safety. The manuscript has too many grammatical mistakes; the authors have to correct it.	