

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJR2H_94376
Title of the Manuscript:	PREDICTABILITY OF PRE-ECLAMPSIA WITH HAEMATOLOGICAL PARAMETERS; A RETROSPECTIVE CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY IN A TEACHING HOSPITAL, GHANA
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.journalijr2h.com/index.php/IJR2H/editorial-policy>)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [ABSTRACT] The 'aim' of this is a bit blurry. What do the authors try to tell on the statement of "To assess the predictive values of neutrophil to lymphocyte ratio (NLR), platelet to lymphocyte ratio (PLR), and mean platelet volume (MPV) in pre-eclamptic patients"? Those variables were meant to predict what kind of dependent variable among pre-eclamptic patients? Is it meant to solely compare the pre-eclamptic vs. normal population? • [ABSTRACT] The analysis results were stated thoroughly, however. I believe it is more important to include the analysis result of NLR and PLR rather than Haemoglobin, HCT, etc. since it is better suited with the objective of this study. • [ABSTRACT] The authors do not state whether the NLR and PLR provided a notable predictive value in the 'conclusion' section, consider to add a concluding statement as concordant with the aim of this study. • [INTRODUCTION] The line between the 3rd and later sentences in the 4th paragraph is unclear, please consider to connect the statements i.e., explaining the mechanism between endothelial malfunction and NPR, LPR, and MPV involvement. • [INTRODUCTION] The closing introduction's statement (5th paragraph) finally draw a fine line of the objective of this study. Consider to rephrase the title and aim of the abstract section. • [METHODS] How do exactly the authors determine the gestational age? Is it solely a history taking-based data taking? Established by physical examination? Or the authors used any valid data measurement method of this information? Please consider to add a statement regarding this issue. • [RESULTS] The authors conducted an additional analysis to determine whether there were some observable correlations between NLR, PLR, and MPV; however. I believe this section might minimally add the relevance of this study to its aim. Thus, consider to state the rationale and clinical significance of these findings e.g., is higher NLR might translate to higher PLR and MPV? In which what is the beneficial aspect in establishing the correlation by Spearman Rank correlation? • [DISCUSSION] The cited study by Kirbas et al. (2015) basically analysed first-trimester hematological parameter levels rather than including all birthing patients at their centre then measure the NPR, LPR, and MPV; they had previously measured those parameters in the first-three month of pregnancy. Consider to elaborate the difference between this study and the published evidence therefore a statement of "predicting" can be agreed. • [DISCUSSION] On the result section, the authors had depicted the diagnostic accuracies of NLR, PLR, and MPV in which all of them are poorly defining the risk of pre-eclampsia; although the analysis stated MPV might possess a considerable yet low-diagnostic value (AUC 0.609, P-value 0.02). Please consider to add and elaborate this low value finding on this section, is it still necessary to consider MPV as the predictive or "changed" parameters among pre-eclamptic patients? • [DISCUSSION] I view this section of the manuscript as the lengthier version in term of explaining the reason behind hematologic parameter of NPR, LPR, and MPV; either it is inadequately explained or the current evidence of science is insufficient. Please kindly elaborate the possible correlation from pathology point-of-view, whether a previously altered hematologic studies result might predict pre-eclampsia occurrence, or the occurrence of pre-eclampsia itself influence some changes in hematological parameters? Therefore, the authors need to establish the correlation model immediately. • [CONCLUSION] I believe the more appropriate conclusion of this study is the level of MPV (and hypothetically NPR and LPR) is higher in pre-eclamptic patients rather than predicting its occurrence beforehand. The fact that this study included confirmed pre-eclamptic patients, it is more reasonable to state that those parameters might be altered after the disease recurrence rather than acting a predisposing factor, although its predictive value (e.g., pregnant woman with gestational age of 20 week and high MPV might possesses higher chance of pre-eclampsia) remain questionable. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [ABSTRACT] Consider to rephrase the result section thus the abstract content's can be delivered better rather than proposing every finding into this section. • [INTRODUCTION] Most of the statement of the 1st to 3rd paragraph is irrelevant to the aim of this study since it basically elaborating pre-eclampsia in general and I believe it may be better to do it in a single-paragraph only. Consider to shorten or remove some statements. • [METHODS] Since this is a retrospective cross-sectional study, please state the exact date of the start and end of this study rather than mentioning month-to-month period. • [METHODS] Consider to substitute "recruited" with "included" since the statement partially delineating a trial is going on. • [METHODS] Consider to disclose a statement in "Blood Pressure Measurements", whether the BP measurement was performed by a single-person? Or is there any factor influencing the decision to not use digital-based measurement since operator-based BP measurement might possess a notable disadvantage. • [RESULTS] Is there any particular reason to use median (Q1-Q3) model to show the data compared to mean \pm SD? Please state it in the method section. • [RESULTS] Consider to add the 'cut-off' value for the measured diagnostic parameters. • [DISCUSSION] The 2nd and 3rd paragraph of this section appear to be mostly unnecessary though some information regarding pre-eclampsia 	

Review Form 1.6

	<p>might be needed to act as the basic introduction of the disease. Consider to shorten and paraphrase these sections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• [DISCUSSION] Please consider to add another limitation of this study, and state the reason of choosing “predicting” words to determine the correlation between analysed variables, and the disease’s occurrence.• [DISCUSSION] The authors had mentioned an “inconsistency’ issue regarding the correlation between analysed variables as cited on several literatures. Are several factors e.g., phlebotomist’s experience, testing method, or utilized materials might influence the result of this study? Consider to disclose it in the discussion section.• [CONCLUSION] Consider to shorten the conclusion as it was too lengthy for a closing remark.	
Optional/General comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Generally, the manuscript is poorly defined their aim in the result and discussion section, regardless to the fact that the objective of this manuscript as depicted by the title itself remain questionable. Overall, the writing of this manuscript had been enjoyable to read, though the delivered content might need a MAJOR CHANGES according to my expertise and perspective. Please consider these reviews and comments as a suggestion to improve the quality of your work.	

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer’s comment</u>	<u>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>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Sarma N Lumbanraja
Department, University & Country	Universitas Sumatera Utar, Indonesia