

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of Biochemistry Research & Review
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJBCRR_111182
Title of the Manuscript:	A multicentric verification of hereditary and acquired thrombophilia coagulation assays
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

Review Form 1.7

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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>Yes. Though it's shallow, can be of great impact to the community once developed further.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>No</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We intended to present the substantial effort that precedes the introduction of specialized coagulation assays involved in thrombophilia testing to sensitize the laboratory community about the importance of verification studies. Through our verification, we prevented the premature introduction of antithrombin testing that could result in a falsely increased AT activity in patients due to a significant positive bias observed through a comparison study.</p> <p>We have reorganized the abstract, as described in the Optional/General comments section.</p>
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The abstract of the article is lacking more information</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We have completely rewritten the study design paragraph: An extensive and multicentric verification of coagulation assays included in thrombophilia testing was performed on the BCS XP coagulation analyzer (Siemens Healthineers, Marburg, Germany): antithrombin activity (AT) (Innovance Antithrombin), protein C activity (PC) (Berichrom Protein C), protein S activity (PS) (Protein S Ac), free protein S antigen (free PS:Ag) (Innovance Free PS Ag), activated protein C resistance (APCR) (ProC Ac R and ProC Global + Coagulation Factor V Deficient Plasma), lupus anticoagulant (LA) screening (LA1 and activated partial thromboplastin time by using Dade Actin FSL as reagent) and confirmation test (LA2), factor VIII activity (FVIII) (Dade Actin FS and coagulation FVIII Deficient Plasma).</p> <p>Also, some concrete results were added in the Results paragraph: Results: All of the obtained imprecision CVs were within the manufacturer's claims (<5/10/15%). While the observed bias for PC (+1.9%) was within the EFLM performance specifications (6.7%), the average bias for AT was higher than acceptance</p>

Review Form 1.7

		criteria (+10.8% vs 3.2% allowed). P&B regression revealed a significant positive proportional difference (slope=1.14). The Methodology paragraph was shortened to preserve the allowed number of words.
--	--	---

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	