

---

# ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

***ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!***

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Reviewer Name:   | Email:                                   |
| Date Manuscript Received: 27/09/2018   | Date Review Report Submitted: 28/09/2018 |
| Manuscript Title: <b>ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE, ATTITUDE AND PRACTICE ON VOLUNTARY BLOOD DONATION IN SHKODRA CITY.</b> |  |
| ESJ Manuscript Number: 1034/18   |  |
| You agree your name to be revealed to the author of the paper: Yes   |  |

## Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

| <i>Questions</i>   | <i>Rating Result</i><br>[Poor] 1-5<br>[Excellent] |
|--|---|
| <b>1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.</b>                                       | <b>5</b>  |
| <i>(Please insert your comments)</i>   |   |
| <b>2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.</b>  | <b>3</b>  |
| <i>The abstract can be strengthened by briefly explaining the key findings of the study. The rest is very clear.</i> |   |
| <b>3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.</b>                                    | <b>3</b>  |
| <i>It would be good to edit the English grammar of the article. It will improve the presentation.</i>                |   |
| <b>4. The study methods are explained clearly.</b>   | <b>3</b>  |
| <i>Need to justify the methodological approach. Explain the ethical considerations.</i>                              |   |

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| <b>5. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.</b>                     | <b>3</b> |
| <i>What are the key findings and how they impact on future?</i>                                     |          |
| <b>6. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.</b>   | <b>4</b> |
| <i>As you justify methodological approach and explain ethics, there will be further references.</i> |          |

**Overall Recommendation** (mark an X with your recommendation) :

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Accepted, no revision needed               |          |
| Accepted, minor revisions needed           | <b>X</b> |
| Return for major revision and resubmission |          |
| Reject                                     |          |

**Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):**

This is a very interesting and useful articles. Following are my suggestions to strengthen this article:

- a. Edit the English grammar, which will improve the presentation.
- b. In abstract, please briefly present the key findings.
- c. Your methodology section needs to be strengthened by explaining the following:
  - i. Explain your selected methodological approach
  - ii. Justify the methodology and methods
  - iii. Explain the ethics approval and ethical consideration
- d. In the Discussion section of the paper, please explain how the results are contributing to the future of blood donation (for volunteers) and services (Albanian Red Cross).

**Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:**

