

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AIR_98641
Title of the Manuscript:	Socioeconomic Status as a Determinant of Delayed Diagnosis of Sickle Cell Disease - A Case Report of Newly Diagnosed Sickle Cell Disease in a 52-Year-Old Woman
Type of the Article	Case report

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.journalair.com/index.php/AIR/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		
1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)	Yes	
2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes but need a minor change (mentioned in manuscript)	
3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?	Yes	
4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Yes	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)	References sufficient	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, but the case report has to be modified according to author guidelines. Corrections needed has mentioned in the manuscript	
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:	Durga Prasad TS
Department, University & Country	Sri Padmavathi School of Pharmacy, India