



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJR2H_64718
Title of the Manuscript:	COVID-19Pandemic: Laboratory Diagnostic Methods and Related Biosafety Regulations.
Type of the Article	Review 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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The spelling in the text has been corrected on the incorrect punctuation text. 2. References should be reconsidered, number and date should be added, spelling mistakes should be corrected. 3. Only surnames should be given in references, the initials of the names should be written in capital letters. 4. Each title is capitalized at the beginning of the article. This rule does not exist in other subtitles. Attention should be paid to these. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Let's develop the symptoms shown in Reference 7. Let's add diare ... etc 2. (table 1 should be made more visible in terms of shape) 3. (table 2 should be made more visible in terms of shape) I don't know the journal format, but each row and column in the tables should be separated, providing a clear visuality to the reader. 4. (table 3 should be made more visible in terms of shape) 5. Table words in the text should be written in capital letters. 6. There is no reference to table 4 in the text. 7. References in the text should be given at the end of the sentence. 8. Table 6 should be referred in the text. 9. Table 6 should be presented with better visibility 10. Figures should be referred to in the text. 	
Optional/General comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. .Key words too long SARS-COV2 Shortened enough enough 2. The recognition of sars co2 given in the first paragraph by certain organizations should be shortened. Much detail has been given. 3. In introduction this sentence may be change 'SARS-COV-2 belongs to the β-coronavirus family' 4. 3.1.3 Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats (CRISPR) Based Methods should explain why places such as hospitals and airports are recommended. Amalgation disunderstandbl in original reference (Fifty-four (85.7%) patients had patchy / punctate ground glass opacities, 14 (22.2%) patients had GGO, 12 (19.0%) patients had patchy consolidation, 11 (17.5%) had patients fibrous stripes and 8 (12.7%) patients had irregular solid nodules. Fifty-four (85.7%) patients progressed, including single GGO increased, enlarged and consolidated; fibrous stripe enlarged, while solid nodules increased and enlarged) used correct definations. In this paper msut be change regular 5. results should be improved 	



[SDI 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:	Belgin Oral
Department, University & Country	Atatürk Chest Diseases and Chest Surgery Training and Research Hospital, Turkey