

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_90401
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE AND CLINICAL ASPECTS OF HEMOPHILIA IN THE WESTERN REGION OF CAMEROON
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.journalibrr.com/index.php/IBRR/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		
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>This is a very well-written and interesting paper. It is educational and the findings are important and relevant. I have several observations and questions.</p> <p>I am not completely sure of the method used in patient recruitment. Was this based only on patient reporting to a specific health center that has a common database with the other centers? How do you know that others had bleeding complaints but did not report it or present to one of the 5 centers? Sometimes a flow diagram is helpful. I reread the method section multiple times and I was still confused how the study group was selected. It sounds like it was partly randomized by household rather than individual.</p> <p>Also, should you define the ages of 'boy'? 0-18 years? Is this valid since the father is also included? '...but also affects around girls in France..' I think you forgot the percentage.</p> <p>I think an important component to the message of this paper would be the historic outcome of hemophiliacs in the last decade. Would it be possible to find the outcomes of this group and note the mortality rate. A rate that could be improved if adequate access were available.</p> <p>'...a mean age of 14.85 (1.5-49).' Typically when a mean is used the SD is used. When the median is used the range is given. In this case, my guess is that your SD is close to the mean therefore you should probably use the median (range). I think I missed it. Who paid for the study?</p>	

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:	Steve Carlan
Department, University & Country	Winnie Palmer Hospital, Florida