



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_26292
Title of the Manuscript:	Female Gender Contribution in Blood Donation and Alternatives: Fact & Factual
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	Introduction The objective should be stated of which were addressed in the study, otherwise the objectives do not reflected to the title line no. 84-87 Methodology: - -There should be a clear definition of donation type used [Voluntary vs. non-voluntary (Family/replacement, paid, autologous)] or it was about voluntary vs replacement line no. 95-102, 112-114, 129 and 133 Study design :type of retrospective study- It should be clearly mentioned as Cross-sectional; Line no. 11,91 and 235 - Did the study involve blood donors or number of units donated/donations conducted? Line number 14 vs 95 - At which stage of the study Professional and Paid were eliminated? And what were the reasons? Line no.102 -How was Data collection method, inclusive and exclusive criteria, data collection tool? Data analysis -The usage of incidence instead of proportion of which is most appropriate for such study design Line no.116 and 121 -The study seems to involve Descriptive and Inferential statistics rather than comparative/strength of association, thus the usage and interpretation of Chi-square's results is misleading. Number line 107-109,199-220 and 239-240	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	- Discussion -The discussion should involve comparing and contrasting of the current study results with other studies, rather than mentioning other literatures <i>Line no.176-233</i> Ethical issues: NO- Not mentioned if permission was sought and granted to use the data from the bank nor Ethical clearance from any ethical review board	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- What were selection and Information bias found in this study? <i>Line no. 235-236</i> -Were there role of confounders? How were they taken care of? IF not can we still confidently rule out the role of chance of LOW participation of the women? -Can we confidently generalize the results from this study?	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	- The language should be revised by a language consultant.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Wilhellmuss Isael Mauka</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Kilimnajar Christian Medcical University College, Tanzania</i>