

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_97767
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence, Pattern of Disease and outcome of Children with Sickle Cell Disease admitted in a Private Health Facility in Southern Nigeria
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.journalajpr.com/index.php/AJPR/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)	It is a disease of high morbidity and mortality. Very heterogeneous at clinical, hematological and molecular level. Acceptable. Acceptable. Acceptable. Correct. Acceptable	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Acceptable enough for communication	
Optional/General comments	Genotypes of the patients should be described, at least, true homozygotes or compound heterozygotes with other abnormal hemoglobins or thalassemias. A better discussion can be made through phenotype-genotype relationship in the sub-headings and discussion sections.	

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>	

Reviewer Details:

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