

### Review Form 3

|                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name:            | <a href="#">International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology</a>                                   |
| Manuscript Number:       | Ms_IJR2H_129725   |
| Title of the Manuscript: | <b>Prevalence and incidence of the risk of transfusion-transmitted malaria in the Dschang Health District</b> |
| Type of the Article      |   |

#### PART 1: Comments

|   | Reviewer's comment  | Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|---|--|
| <b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b> | <p>It is good that this manuscript focused at one of the most important public health problems (malaria) in sub-Saharan Africa. It tried to address the problem by integrating infectious disease with Hematology and Immunohematology. By assessing transfusion-transmissible infections among blood donors and recipients it tried to show the magnitude of the problem with the aim of improving the quality transfusion medicine service and its health outcome. However, the methods used to address the research question and the result described were not adequate and in line with the title and objective of the study.</p> <p>This manuscript has many issues in the title, abstract, objective, method, result, discussion, and conclusion section. Hence, it needs substantial revision and improvement to be fit for publication. I have put details of my comments in each section of the manuscript. Besides, I have also put my suggestion to improve this manuscript in its each section.</p> | Noted  |
| <b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>   | <p>Not suitable and not self-explanatory according to the method and result of the manuscript. The title should contain country name, as a prevalence/incidence study varies by place, population and time.</p> <p>Suggested title: <b>Prevalence of malaria among blood donors and recipients in Dschang Health District, West Cameroon</b></p>  | Title revised  |
| <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>      | <p>Where are important sections of an abstract? Where is the major outcome variable indicated in the title (i.e. malaria in the method &amp; result section)? The result described in the abstract section is not in line with the title and the general objective of the study.</p> <p>Generally, the abstract section needs substantial improvement. Clearly indicate important sections of an abstract (introduction/background, objective, method, result &amp; conclusion). Clearly describe the major outcome variable indicated in the title (i.e. malaria in the method &amp; result section). Align the result described here with the title and the general objective of the study.</p>   | Revision made  |
| <b>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</b>  | <p>How did you control the malaria due to mosquito-bite during the 14 days follow-up period? If no any measure was taken, how do you confidently conclude that the infection found after transfusion is just due to transfusion of <i>Plasmodium</i> infected blood? Besides, considering the issue of recurrence (relapse, re-infection &amp; recrudescence) and the limitation of the diagnostic tool you used (RDT sensitivity &amp; species range owing to its brand that you did not mention) to screen the recipients, is it possible to generalize as transfusion-transmitted malaria? What statistical test was used to determine relative risk?</p>  | Noted and effected   |
| <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>                              | <p><b>Partial.</b></p> <p>For example, despite the presence of recent and locally (in Cameroon and English publication) relevant in the SSA and Cameroon, the author used relatively older and French article that is not open access (difficult to download the full text) for sample size calculation. Besides, the author should include some data and reference into the introduction section to show the problem of TTI from global to local</p>   | Ok done s  |

**Review Form 3**

|  |  |                    |
|--|--|--------------------|
|  | perspective. Besides, the author should revise the bibliography section to make it consistent.   |                    |
| <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b> | Yes.   |                    |
| <b><u>Optional/General</u> comments</b>  | Inconsistency of word use among title, abstract, objective, and conclusion sections. Better to make them consistent by revising in all pertinent sections. Better to write conclusion in sentences that indicates the implication, but not overtly using numbers. It is better to include recommendation based on your particular finding in the conclusion and recommendation section. Better to include the major outcome variable here. Example : Malaria, Transfusion transmissible infections. Plasmodium, Dschang, Cameroon, Narration sentences about data contained a table should come before the table. Tables Captions for tables and figures should be self-explanatory. How did you determine the status (symptomatic Vs asymptomatic). I did not see any sentences describing the measurement of temperature or assessing history of fever or any other work to establish the asymptomatic or symptomatic status? Do not discuss results in the result section. Present just the result without detail interpretation or implication. Interpretation and implication are expected to appear in the discussion and conclusion section. What is the possible explanation for the two recipients found negative after reportedly received a positive blood unit? Spontaneous clearance or prophylaxis or diagnostic limitation (due to RDT inherent problem) or what? since you used PCR? | Noted and included |

**PART 2:**

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | <b><u>Reviewer's comment</u></b>  | <b><u>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></b> |
| <b><u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u></b> | <b><u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u></b> |   |