

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Hematology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AHRJ_91805
Title of the Manuscript:	SIGNIFICANCE OF SOME HEMATOLOGICAL PARAMETERS IN TYPE 2 DIABETIC PATIENTS IN THE ENUGU STATE UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY TEACHING HOSPITAL, ENUGU STATE, NIGERIA
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.journalahrj.com/index.php/AHRJ/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	<p>The abstract can be rewritten as a structured format</p> <p>Introduction Research significance Methodology Results Conclusion</p> <p>This is a cross sectional study so the authors can consider reporting it using the Strobe Checklist for cross sectional studies https://www.strobe-statement.org/checklists/ If the intent is to investigate whether changes in haematological parameters can lead to development of complications of T2DM then the suggested comparisons should be T2DM with complications vs T2DM without complications The current study is looking at T2DM vs non-T2DM and will not answer the question of interest Please rewrite the justification Please provide details on how many patients were approached and rejected The sample size calculation is wrong If the intent is to compare between T2DM and non T2DM, sample size calculation should be set to detect a minimum difference between the 2 groups Consult with a statistician if you are unsure</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ang Yee Gary
Department, University & Country	Singapore