

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Hematology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AHRJ_106222
Title of the Manuscript:	ASSESSMENT OF SOME HAEMOSTATIC FACTORS IN ELDERLY PEOPLE IN KEFFI, NASARAWA STATE.
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.journalahri.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)
<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><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>APTT and PT were longer, while bleeding time were shorter in the elderly. This may suggest an age-specific reference range for the elderly.</p> <p>The study did not perform haemostatic factor assays. Haemostatic assays in healthy elderly in.....</p> <p>'Significant variations' is unclear. Please specify shorter or longer.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>1. There were differences in ethnicity between the groups. The effects of ethnicity on haemostatic tests should be explored.</p> <p>2. Were there differences between sexes?</p> <p>3. In discussion, the results should be compared with previous studies.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>International 'normalised' ratio should be used to be consistent (British English).</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ponlapat Rojnuckarin
Department, University & Country	Chulalongkorn University, Thailand