



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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Title: The study is more of describing the findings hence the suitable title would be <i>The Prevalence of Adverse Transfusion.....</i> Instead of "Determinants" of which would be more appropriate if there could be measure of association involved. <i>Line 2-4</i> Abstract: The word "Incidence" should be replaced by <i>Prevalence</i> : (<i>Taking into account the study design which did not include follow-up of cases -thus more of cross sectional study</i>)From Line 16 and elsewhere Omit the word "11/46" and instead be 11 only. Line 18 Introduction: The following need citation and references. Line 40-43, 45-46, 49-57, 62-64, 69-74, 76-78, 83-87, 89-90, Statement was copied from the original work... Please re-phrase the statement. <i>Line 95-97</i> Paragraph from line 102-105 it would be more appropriate if it would appear in the part of introduction as a summary while concluding the introduction part Methodology: In my understanding the Study was not carried within two years but it used reported data of period of two years Line 107&119, appropriate would be; <i>This was retrospective cross-sectional study, reviewed and analyzed reported all transfusion during period of two years.....</i> Line 107	Determinants were used to highlight observed factors associated with adverse transfusion reactions with a view to preventing the reactions. Incidence has been replaced by Prevalence 11/46 has been replaced with 11 The citations and references have been added The statement has been re-phrased Statement has been added to the last line of introduction Methodology re-phrased to convey this meaning



SDI Review Form 1.6

	-Review your study population... Otherwise if it involved only reported cases of reactions then denominator will not be all transfusion (5,342) Line 112 vs 118 Before data presentation clearly describe how data were analysed- Line 115 -Variable Anemia category: It would be appropriate if you would give the definition of anemia in this study. Type of anemia or mechanism of blood loss (Acute blood loss, Chronic blood loss) since hemorrhage may lead to anemia since hemorrhage=anemia. Line 140-141 -No second proportion/data to make it respective-Line 142 and 144 -Rephrase the sentence, it is not understood. Line 192-194 -The statement is more like a recommendation rather than discussion 192-200 Ethical consideration not mentioned anywhere, the author should let the readers know that the study was ethically conducted. Plagiarism issue: Yes Line 95-97 (Py <i>et al.</i>, 2009) Py, J.-Y., Leo-Kodeli, S., Fauveau, L., Duedari, N. and Roubinet, F. (2009). [Hypotension and adverse transfusion reactions: from the associated clinical signs to the hypotensive transfusion reaction]. <i>Transfusion clinique et biologique : journal de la Société française de transfusion sanguine</i>, 16 (1), p.12–20. [Online]. Available at: doi:10.1016/j.tracli.2009.01.004 [Accessed: 14 August 2016].	5342 was the total transfusions out of which 46 adverse transfusions were recorded Described Definition added Re-phrased Re-phrased Re-phrased Did not apply Re-phrased
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Categorize the variable age into fewer groups at least 3 or 4 Line 212 A bar chart with variable of two observations appear out of place ; Pie chart would be a better figure for such data presentation Line 213 and 226 Indications in the table written in short form there should be keynote for them otherwise write in the long form line 245,	Has been re-categorized into 4 groups Figures replaced with pie charts Has been written in long form
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The role of Bias and chances should be pointed out	Noted