

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_IJR2H_98412</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Vitamin D Deficiency and Sickle Bone Disease: A Case Report</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case study</b>

### 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.journaljr2h.com/index.php/IJR2H/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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b> 4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b> 5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b> 6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b> <b>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</b>	1. <b>Yes, it is important. But one case may not significantly represent the data. More cases are needed.</b> 2. <b>Yes, the title is suitable for the article.</b> 3. <b>Article should be written with results or findings.</b> 4. <b>Diagnostic procedure to identify the Sickle Bone Disease is not well-defined and sequence is not followed to representing the disease.</b> 5. <b>The manuscript is scientifically correct but it should be précised.</b> 6. <b>Yes, the References are sufficient and recent.</b> 7. <b>It is an important article for SBD but it is suggested to collect more cases that will presents the significant findings.</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments 1. <b>Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Some syntax errors were observed. Please correct it.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	It can be published after fulfilling the above mentioned findings.	

### 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)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

### Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Mohammad Nazrul Islam</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Hamdard University Bangladesh, Bangladesh</b>