



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_60415
Title of the Manuscript:	Mineral content and Antisickling activity of <i>Annona senegalensis</i> , <i>Alchornea cordifolia</i> and <i>Vigna unguiculata</i> used in the management of sickle cell disease in the Kwilu province(CONGO, DR)
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/journal/10/editorial-policy>)



SDI 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>This is an important investigation into the effects of three phytomedicines in sickle cell disease, which could be potentially beneficial. The study objectives were clearly spelt out, and methods to obtain them identified. However, it was not clear how conclusions were made from the study. Inferences were made without statistical analyses of discrete or quantitative data provided. The following need to be clarified:</p> <p>METHODOLOGY: What is the study design? What was the time frame for not transfusing people with SCD whose blood was used for the tests 'None of the patients had been transfused recently with Hb AA blood' What was age of patients for the study that gave informed consent? 'An informed consent was obtained from all the patients selected in the study.' Was an ethical clearance from an Institutional Review Board or Ethics Committee obtained for the study? 'Ethical clearance on the use of sickle blood cells was strictly observed according to international rules' Reference the rules referred to.</p> <p>Mineral Composition determination: How much of the prepared powder was compressed into pellets? Was it the same for the three plants? 'A quantity of the powder was compressed into pellets'</p> <p>RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS: Was there a sample size calculation done to establish the number of in vitro experiments required to establish a definite conclusion to the antisickling or antihaemolytic effect of the phytomedicines on SCD? How many were actually done on the three phytomedicines?</p> <p>Antihaemolytic effect: Provide the percentage of hypotonic NaCl that was used in the study. Provide discrete quantitative data for the measured optical density at different time points for the plants. What statistical test, and their results were used to compare the data from baseline and at different time points. How were the conclusions arrived at scientifically?</p> <p>Macroelements: The relationship of sodium content in food plants to SCD is what is relevant to this study and should be inputted. According to Martinez-ballesta et al. [24], the sodium content in food plants generally varies between 0.04 to 277 mg / 100g or 0.4 to 2770 ppm which is consistent with the content of most of our plants.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	The language of the paper was difficult to read and understand in some parts.	
Optional/General comments		

Comment [O.01]: How recently? Put a time frame eg 3 or 6 months

Comment [O.02]: Who provided ethical clearance?

Comment [O.03]: How much? Was it the same for each plant?

Comment [O.04]: effect in scd

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:	Oluseyi Oniyangi
Department, University & Country	Nigeria