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In this systematic review, the authors bring a topic of extreme relevance to the health of the population and especially raise important findings that reveal the dimension of the problem related to hemotherapy, which should be strongly regulated in all countries with deep technical bases, aiming at the protection donor and recipient.

The material presented has clear, synthetic and systematized writing, allowing the reader a clear understanding of the findings and arguments presented by the authors. The abstract objectively reproduces the content of the work.

The problem of the study is very clear, the introduction well contextualized announcing the great challenges of the problem in question, since according to the authors the safety of blood transfusion is maintained in most of Ethiopia, however, there is still inconsistent screening of large ITTs, such as HIV, in some areas of the country.

The objective of the study was fully achieved and the method was consistent with the study proposal, in addition to using complex, robust statistics. The results are understandably comprehensive with the use of appropriate, well-constructed figures and graphs.

As for the arguments and dialogues with other authors presented in the discussion, they were important and they contributed to the theme. However, it still deserved further study. The conclusion was consistent with the findings and the list of references is extensive and relevant, but some of them deserve to be updated.

I make few suggestions, which are more focused on the issue of writing, considering that in my opinion, the article is ready to be published.

In the method, I suggest starting by making clear that it is a systematic review with meta-analysis.
In the results in addressing the characteristics of the included studies, they committed grammatical failures by repeatedly repeating between lines 156 and 162 the word "study". So they should make the text cleaner by avoiding these repetitions.

In line 197 of the results, add that there was no statistically significant difference in HIV seropositivity between male and female donors.

In the discussion, avoid repetition of results. Thus, I suggest reconstructing the writing of lines 208/209, as follows: "The prevalence of HIV infection found in this study is consistent with findings from similar ones conducted in different countries."

As for the references, although very pertinent and mostly up-to-date, some need to be renovated considering they are 20 years old or older.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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