

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJR2H_88195
Title of the Manuscript:	Circulating level of platelet activation biomarker -Platelet factor 4, in sickle cell anaemia patients in Edo State, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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.journaljr2h.com/index.php/IJR2H/editorial-policy>)

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	1. There is a confusion on the number of study subjects (either 80 or 40), and the study Groups: 2 groups (case and control) or 4 groups. Revision of the description in the paragraphs 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 as well as the methodology section of the abstract is recommended. 2. Many exclusion criteria described in section 2.5.2 are not appropriate. Exclusion criteria are not the ones opposite to the inclusion criteria; and those subject not in line with the inclusion criteria will not be available for exclusion.	This has been taken care of. Eligibility criteria has been modified.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1. In the 'Introduction" section, the author should mention about the gap of knowledge or the issue needed to be explore which is the reason for conducting this study. There is no such problem statement (or hypothesis) in the introduction. 2. The author should separate 'Discussion' section from the 'Results'.	Corrections have been made.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This is a reliable study due to the use of laboratory investigation. The article should be published after the revision based on the above comments. Some minor comments are provided in the attached manuscript.	

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)	No ethical issues.