

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Hematology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AHRJ_84057
Title of the Manuscript:	DETERMINATION OF IN VITRO ANTICOAGULANT EFFECT OF ACACIA NILOTICA EXTRACT ON NORMAL HUMAN BLOOD SAMPLES
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.journalahrj.com/index.php/AHRJ/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	<p>Abstract: "Blood samples were collected from all participants without anticoagulant. The serum was mixed with different concentrations..."</p> <p>Comment: This description seems fallacious. If whole blood were collected, it would spontaneously coagulate within ~ 7 min. The resultant serum would no longer contain fibrinogen to coagulate. What is there to test or to measure?</p> <p>Section 2.1 IN VITRO WHOLE BLOOD CLOTTING TIME</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The procedure is not clearly described. Presumably, a given volume of freshly drawn whole blood was mixed with 100 ul extract. Requires clearer description of methodology..• How was clot retraction measured? Not really described.• The plant extract is not characterized at all. What was in the extract? <p>Section 3. Results Many tables with many numbers that do not clarify the point. As there are only a few parameters being measured, it does not require intensive statistical treatment or analysis. If the effect of the extract relates to platelet activity, then a study on platelets would have been required i.e. aggregation profile, activation etc. What is the point of this study...does it relate to a standard test or clinical parameter?</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gerard Marx
Department, University & Country	Israel