

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Hematology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AHRJ_99159
Title of the Manuscript:	POPULATION BASED HAEMATOLOGICAL REFERENCE RANGES FOR ADULTS IN NIGERIA: An Update
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.journalahrj.com/index.php/AHRJ/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		
<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. (Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes – it outlines the hematological parameters of the adult healthy population of the several ethnic groups of Nigeria using a newly acquired automated analyser.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No. The text mentions the differences, yet the conclusions are the lack of differences. It needs to be re-written to reflect both the presence and absence of differences in the different ethnic groups.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>It is an assumption that the auto-analyser is superior to a manual differential count. While it may be correct for hemograms in healthy people, it is known to be erroneous in leukemias.</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes. In a few areas, there is need to refine the sentence structure: 'noteworthy to note'	
Optional/General comments	There is no place for words like we, us, our, ours in a scientific paper. These may be suitably replace by 'in this study'	

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)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Raghunadharao Digumarti
Department, University & Country	G S L Medical College, India