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Abstract:

Clearly shows the methodological steps of the work as well as its main results. In a way that attracts the reader to the study and favors citations. In the paper's introduction there are data on HIV transmission through blood transfusion, these data are important for the summary

Introduction:

The introduction well founded the research problem to be explored, perhaps in too detailed a form, the authors may choose to be more punctual avoiding long explanations on known topics (HIV, blood transfusion). These are some suggestions to improve reading.

This section is well grounded and shows that the goal is indeed relevant.

Method:

Were the same terms used on all bases? For Cinahl, for example, "CINAHL heads" are required, and for PUBMED "MESH". Using the same descriptors for miscellaneous bases may result in loss.

In the section "Data selection and Eligibility" the reasons for inclusion and exclusion must be grouped together.

Results:

The section "Assessment of publication bias" should be on the Methods.

The results are clear and fairly solid.

The PRISMA flowchart is filled in properly and with very relevant details.
Discussion:

There is no need to repeat that "This systematic review and meta-analysis".

The authors are very successful in explaining their results and placing them in the international scientific debate.

Although the results are simple, its scientific value is undeniable.

Page 11, line 250: Is it supposed to be "lack"?

I missed an explanation in the introduction or discussion about the blood screening process at Ethiopia. I believe that this information will help us to better understand the problem

Conclusion

Just to avoid repeating their method, in our conclusions we should highlight our most important and relevant findings.

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.

Unable to assess

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript
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