



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_67732
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of Changes in Haematological Parameters of Sickle Cell Anaemia Subjects in Rivers State
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>)

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	Materials and methods: According to the analysis of the methodology used in the referred research, it was possible to observe that the statistical data referring to the number of subjects involved in the study shows inconsistency in some points, namely: initially, in the subtopic "study project", the totality is clear (450) of subjects involved and divided into groups, being a control group and two groups that present, considering the degree, clinical symptoms / signs of the disease. However, in the subtopic "sample employed", the author refers only to the number of patients (300) and, in this same topic, it shows that the hospitals / clinics where the patients come from have a record of only 200 patients. The statistical calculation corresponding to a sample of 33 individuals was also not clear, thus requiring a better logical organization of the information so that it does not generate mistakes for the readers. Another point is about the blood samples collected, whether they were from the initial total of individuals (450), only from patients (300) or only from the calculated sample (33)	
Minor REVISION comments	Conclusion: Conclusion consistent with its objectives, but I suggest specifying in the conclusion the most altered hematological parameters in SCA.	
Optional/General comments	Introduction: It brings an excellent literary review of the theme, in a very succinct form. Results And Discussion: I consider the comparisons and discussions of their results to be relevant.	



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:	Pedro Agnel Dias Miranda Neto
Department, University & Country	Centro Universitário Estácio São Luis, Brazil