

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Hematology Research Journal |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AHRJ_99369 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Estimation of protein C by ELISA and measurement of some coagulation changes among Sudanese patients with some solid malignancy |
| Type of the 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.journalahri.com/index.php/AHRJ/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

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) |
|--|--|---|
| <p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p> | <p>There are several publications on the same topic</p> <p>To remove(by ELISA) and(some) at both places</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | No | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <p>The different tumor types included maybe given in a tabular form. Cervical may be written as uterine cervix Remove details of ELISA from methods and give name of kit and manufactures Statistical analysis may be detailed Ethical clearance has not been received for the study Informed consent from patients not mentioned Fibrinogen levels were not sig different in patients and controls:write Discussion is poorly written Conclusion says fibrinogen was different in patients and controls when it was not Discussion may include how this was different from other studies Conclusion cannot be derived from study Correct grammatical errors</p> | |

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Name: | Meera Sikka |
| Department, University & Country | University of Delhi, India |