

## Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Hematology Research Journal</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AHRJ_103004</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Role of bioinformatics based red cell indices in the diagnosis of Iron Deficiency Anemia and to differentiate it from Beta Thalassemia and to assess its reliability in analysing the level of prognosis.</b>
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.journalahrj.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><b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</b> (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</li> <li>2. <b>Is the title of the article suitable?</b> (If not please suggest an alternative title)</li> <li>3. <b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</b></li> <li>4. <b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></li> <li>5. <b>Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</b></li> <li>6. <b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</b></li> </ol> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Yes.</li> <li>2. No.</li> <li>3. No.</li> <li>4. No.</li> <li>5. Yes.</li> <li>6. No, mentioned. See below:</li> </ol> <p>It is my pleasure to review the project titled "Role of bioinformatics based red cell indices in the diagnosis of Iron Deficiency Anemia and to differentiate it from Beta Thalassemia and to assess its reliability in analysing the level of prognosis." The review is an important topic regarding the significance of research on red cell indices differentiating iron deficiency anemia and thalassemias. Although the study is interesting, and the findings likely benefit future researchers, it needs further revisions.</p> <p>Major Issues.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Compared to the other sections, the <i>Introduction</i> section is relatively weak concerning the justification of the current study. The authors provided some statistics; however, the ideas jumped from one to another. There should be smoother transitions between different subsections. Further, bulleted points (for example, in "ETIOLOGY AND PATHOPHYSIOLOGY OF IDA") obstruct the flow of smooth reading. This is a research article, not a textbook; I recommend removing subheadings and presenting a continuous narrative with a smoother flow of different subsections. To reiterate, for example, the authors started with anemia, then went on discussing IDA, then came back to anemia (under SIGNIFICANCE OF IDA), and again returned to IDA. The entire Introduction section needs to be reorganized.</li> <li>2. The authors discussed the beta thalassemia trait in relation to RBC indices. I suggest that authors read a significantly related article [Bhattacharyya et al., (2016). A comprehensive screening program for <math>\beta</math>-thalassemia and other hemoglobinopathies in the Hooghly District of West Bengal, India, dealing with 21 137 cases. <i>Hemoglobin</i>, 40(6), 396–399. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/03630269.2016.1259169">https://doi.org/10.1080/03630269.2016.1259169</a>] and incorporate ideas/information in the context of the current analysis. Relatedly, there are other hemoglobinopathies that should be discussed, too.</li> <li>3. <b>METHODOLOGY:</b> "Database search selected relevant articles on Google scholar, ...and reviewed only full papers." What are the inclusion/exclusion criteria (only based on the year of publication?)" Also, please mention whether this is a systematic, scoping, or other type of review.</li> <li>4. <b>REVIEW OF LITERATURE:</b> This section is confusing whether it is a true literature review OR illustrating results. The "Summary of evaluated hematological indices" should be marked as a <i>Table</i> and a separate text should explicitly describe the findings.</li> <li>5. Regarding the reliability checks, the authors were not clear to ensure accuracy. However, I am curious to see what methodology they followed (including</li> </ol>	

**Review Form 1.7**

	<p>citation): having fuller information about how the decisions were made and agreed upon would convince me that the findings fully and reliably reflect the appropriate methodology.</p> <p>6. RESEARCH GAP: What is this section actually doing? If this is the research gap signifying this study's importance, then this should come before <i>Methodology</i>; otherwise, it should come under the <i>Discussion</i> or as a limitation/s of the current study.</p> <p>7. The authors' objective was to analyze "the significance of novel hematological indices to diagnose and differentiate IDA from beta thalassemia cost effectively and time consumable and to assess its reliability in analysing the level of prognosis." However, the <i>Discussion</i> section is deficient in providing a detailed overview of the author's aim and related implications.</p> <p>8. Figure 1 needs a source citation; otherwise, delete it.</p> <p>9. Several typos, including punctuation marks, spacing, etc., need to be corrected.</p> <p>10. Both the reference list and in-text citations need to be consistent. Currently, there are several inconsistencies exist that need to be corrected.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Please follow either US English or British English.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>--</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:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Kallol Kumar Bhattacharyya</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>Alzheimer's Disease and Dementia Research Center, Utah State University, USA</b></p>