

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| Journal Name: | International Blood Research & Reviews |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_IBRR_104616 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Umbilical Cord Blood Processing Techniques and Their Comparative Advantages: A Review |
| Type of the Article | Review |

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.journalibrr.com/index.php/IBRR/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> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The review discusses different methods used for umbilical cord blood banking both in the past and present. I guess there is an attempt to highlight issues leading to improvement of the handling of the cord blood units over time. The review also highlights advantages and disadvantages with different methods. With the aim to bring together the literature on the different processing methods and to highlight the underlying principles of each method, the relative efficiency and advantages of the methods, it may be valuable for the UCB community. 2. The title fits the manuscript. 3. The abstract is somewhat comprehensive. 4. The subsections are appropriate, but the structure is only somewhat appropriate. The text is not so easy to follow and may be more scientifically written. For example; I have never seen the word "workers" been used in a scientific paper. 5. Yes, I believe the manuscript is scientifically correct. 6. Many references are old. It is okay when discussing historical methods, but many methods are referred to a study published at 2010, which means the study was conducted years before that. Are there any more recent studies or is the studies referred to the only ones performed? | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p> | <p>The English language is excellent, but this manuscript is in great need for a secondary round of proof-reading. My reading went from peer reviewing to proof-reading, unfortunately. The abbreviation should be performed at the first time it is mentioned. Only then. The language may be improved to be in a more scientific format.</p> | |
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | | |

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Name: | Åsa Ekblad Nordberg |
| Department, University & Country | Karolinska Institutet, Sweden |