

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_105271
Title of the Manuscript:	Hematological profile of adult haemoglobin SS and SC sickle cell patients in stationary phase: Evidences from National Teaching Hospital of Cotonou in Benin.
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 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 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)	Important. The findings will be beneficial for a better health care delivery and services to the patient population with hemoglobinopathies. Acceptable. Acceptable. Need to be careful and check the units of hematological parameters used in this study.(e.g., WBC differentials are shown in G/L and need to explain it; may be confused with Hb) Findings should be better described by sex separately. Acceptable Acceptable	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Acceptable in general; Inter-critical should be hyphenated (Inter-critical)	
Optional/General comments	Martial deficiency? (The final word in study limitations sub-section) THE(%)? In the table 2. How quality assurance of CBC has been observed should be mentioned in the material and method section and discussion section.	

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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ne Win
Department, University & Country	University of Medicine, Myanmar