

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology</a>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJR2H_84497</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Haematological Parameters of Sickle Cell Disease Patients on Prophylactic Antimalarial Regimen within Port Harcourt, Nigeria.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Original Research Article</b>

### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalijr2h.com/index.php/IJR2H/editorial-policy> )

Review Form 1.6

**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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	<p>Abstract Introduction. In the introduction, references are not used. This section is the same as in the general introduction. Please remove the references and briefly describe the goal. Do not repeat the sentences from the introduction. Please describe the abbreviation for SCD.. Sickle Cell Disease (SCD). The method needs to be modified. For example, the analysis was performed on blood samples of 50 Sickle Cell Disease Patients .... The analyzes were processed using an analyzer .... The conclusion should be short, concise and informative. Here you have explained the results again.</p> <p>Introduction Serious reorganization and improvement is needed. In your study, you did not examine the structure of hemoglobin, but SCD. The introductory part should start about SCD. Finally, it is necessary to introduce the story of hemoglobinopathy and mutations in hemoglobin that result in SCD. Eliminate details about the structure and role of hemoglobin.</p> <p>Methodology The story is repeated in the "study area". Study design contains parts that reappear in the study population. Were the controls and patients similar in age? Sample Collection and Preparation and Laboratory Analysis should be combined. You did not specify an analyzed parameter. Do these 10 researched areas have any different climatic factors? Are all patients exposed to the same time period?</p> <p>Results The description in Table 2 is too broad. It is necessary to point out only the most important facts, and not to describe the data from the table in detail. This can be seen in the table. The results are not clear. You divided the patients into several groups according to age. It is not clear from the table that you have analyzed these groups, but in general. You seem to have compared control subjects and patients, which is fine. However, in human studies, you cannot classify men and women and present them as a common group. The reason is that men and women differ in all hematological parameters, especially RBC and Hb, physiologically. Here you could compare men (control and patients), women (control and patients). This data would have a different result. Why didn't you compare the respondents by age. Maybe between the examined areas? That way you would get more serious and important results. Such statistics give us very little data on the results obtained.</p> <p>Accordingly, the discussion is not adequate. On the other hand, in the discussion, you again state the data from the methods on the structure and number of patients. You also describe the results again in the discussion. The discussion should include a summary of the results, without a detailed description and repetition of numerical values. In general, the discussion is poor, inadequate and not written in accordance with scientific science.</p>	<p>Explained</p> <p>Noted all the suggestion</p>
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>The study is interesting, but presented in this way has no scientific significance. <b>Serious Major revision</b></p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

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