



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_38371
Title of the Manuscript:	External quality assessment of transfusion-transmissible infections testing
Type of the Article	Short 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>)

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	Your citations are not well organized. Where is (1)? Consider elaborate laboratory testing.	Number 1 is the first citation, line 60 in the text of the 'introduction' section (number 2 was placed there by mistake). Laboratory testing is closely elaborated (line 117 to 120 of the revised text) in the 'method' section. It is well known to the laboratories which use similar assays.
Minor REVISION comments	Write NAT in full appropriately.	We have written NAT in full in the text of the introduction section.
Optional/General comments	The abstract looks too long, consider the word count and re-adjust. There are numerous grammar errors, making the general flow inconsistent. Write all abbreviations in full the very first time of their use.	We hope that the abstract is re-adjusted to fit the word count to our maximum. We hope that there are no grammar errors now. We also hope that all abbreviations are written in full the very first time of their use in the abstract as well in the text. We consider the reviewer's remarks very constructive. We tried to do our best to incorporate them in the manuscript. Thank you.

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>