Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	**Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research**
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JAMMR_94466**
Title of the Manuscript:	**Evaluation of the serum status of E-selectin and its correlation with disease severity among patients with sickle cell anaemia in a Nigerian health facility**
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.journaljammr.com/index.php/JAMMR/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		
Minor REVISION comments	Title In the methods, you described the research area. I recommend that you remove in a Nigerian health facility from the title Abstract Steady state is not an adequate term. Methodology. Delete the first sentence. "(SCA, Haemoglobin SS) in steady state and those of control (Haemoglobin AS and Haemoglobin AA) were carried out".... It's very confusing "Data generated were analysed using SPSS software version 20. Ethical approval was obtained" is the methodology. Please remove from the abstract. Reading the rest of the results, it was confusingly explained. Introduction There is a lack of information on the relationship between BMI and the examined problem. It would also be good to explain the forms of haemoglobin. Methods How did you classify the patients/subjects into the three groups? For example, how did you determine the HbAS group? 3mls.. you mean 3 mL? Use an adequate expression. 300ul you mean 300 µL? Please correct the mistakes Result It is necessary to indicate statistically significant values in the table (*) The discussion is well organized. The first few sentences are very informative and can be moved to the introduction.	
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)*	

Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	**Damir Suljevic**
Department, University & Country	**University of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina**