



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_34605
Title of the Manuscript:	Sero-prevalence of Transfusion Transmissible Infections among Voluntary Blood Donors in Rural South Western Uganda: A Retrospective Study
Type of the Article	<i>Original Research Article</i>

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	1) Abstract: the abbreviation "TTI" should be written in full the first time it is used. 2) Show in-text citation numbers as non-bracketed superscripts 3) The last sentence in introduction implies that UBTS Strategies were not being implemented in the study area before the study 4) Methods: were the screening tests done on the donors' blood samples before or after donation? 5) Results: there is discordance between the age groups in the write-up to, and within, Table 1; review the values in Table 1; 6) In Table 4 write-up, and elsewhere, revise "statistical significant" to read "statistically significant"; the P in P-value should be small p 7) Indicate whether the TTIs-positive blood donors acquired the infections through blood transfusion or other routes; state whether the infected blood were transfused to recipients. 8) Reason given for low syphilis prevalence among the study group was speculative and should be expunged. 9) References 2, 3, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 26, 27, 28, 29 37, 39, 40, 41 and 42 are incomplete and should be revised.	1) Abstract: The abbreviation "TTI" was written in full as "Transfusion Transmissible Infections" when first used in the text. 2) The citations in the text were changed to non-bracketed superscripts. 3) The last sentence about UBTS was changed to now read "The knowledge of the occurrence of TTIs among the blood donors in south western Uganda will harness the understanding of the frequency of these highly infectious TTIs in the region, which will in turn foster the design and implementation of the Uganda Blood Transfusion Safety strategies. " 4) Methods: As stated in the methodology section donors were bled after passing the pre-donation examinations and then the part of the donated blood were screened for TTIs. Those blood samples found positive were discarded using standard procedures. 5) Results: The discordance in the age groups both in the tables and in the text were corrected and harmonized.



SDI Review Form 1.6

		6) In Table 4 write up and elsewhere within the text the word statistically significant was corrected appropriately and P-value was changed to lower script p-values accordingly. 7) As stated in number 4 above the purpose of screening the blood samples is to safe guard recipient from first doing no harm to them. Therefore any blood sample that is tested and found to be positive for any of the TTIs are discarded using a set standard method. Again with the current screening method that is being used in our setting it is rather difficult to ascertain if to whether the donors acquire infection from transfusion practices or not. But because of the robust BT screening being conducted in the whole regions in Uganda, the acquisition of TTIs has drastically reduced as shown by the result of this research. 8) The reason that was given for the low prevalence of syphilis in Uganda was expunged. 9) The references NOs:2,3,15,16,17,18,19,26,27,28,29,37,39, 40,41,42,43 were corrected plus others that were not completed.
--	--	--



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. Revise the grammatical outlay of the manuscript	The grammatical outlay of the manuscript was fully addressed
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		