

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ JPRI_78833
Title of the Manuscript:	Determination of Coagulation Profile among Children with Sickle Cell: Anemia in Steady State and Crisis
Type of the 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.journalijtdh.com/index.php/IJTDH/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>In the abstract it is unclear how many patients are enrolled in the study, it must be inferred until it is more clearly stated in the results.</p> <p>More detailed description of control selection. Were these selected from the emergency department? The methods sound like the sickle cell patients were enrolled from the emergency department but I'm not sure about the controls. If the controls were enrolled from the ED why were they presenting? It appears that two controls had blood transfusions. Why were they transfused? Did they have a separate coagulation disorder or just a previous trauma?</p> <p>It would be ideal to annotate Table 1 to make it clear that blood transfusion represents history of blood transfusion (not within 3 months). Otherwise one might assume looking at the table that the controls received blood secondary to trauma which would make them poor controls considering trauma is associated with coagulopathy.</p> <p>Consultation with a biostatistician is recommended. A cross comparison between the three group (control, steady state and crisis) is necessary to support the authors conclusion. As the authors demonstrate there is heterogeneity in the case population by the differences note between steady state and crisis patients, thus consideration needs to consider this in the analysis and how the data is presented</p> <p>There are numerous typos and grammatical errors throughout the paper and in the tables. For example, “tribe” as “tripe,” “significant” as “significance,” “sickle (?)” as “stickler’s,” a period in place of a comma, etc... It is unclear in some areas within the results regarding which lab values are being described.</p>	<p>We correct the participants size: A total of 150 children were enrolled as follow, 50 children with SCA in steady state, 50 in crisis, and 50 with Hb AA genotype as control</p> <p>Control group were apparently healthy individuals, have Hb AA genotype, attending out patient’s clinic. They transfused because they have had trauma (5 months before).</p> <p>Agreed, we note that blood transfusion represents history of blood transfusion.</p> <p>Agree.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <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>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	No ethical issue