

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJR2H_126618
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of the Alterations in Haematological Parameters of Cervical Cancer Subjects in Port Harcourt
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/> Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The present manuscript is very interesting knowing that cervical cancer remains a significant global health concern, with a high incidence and mortality rate among women. So, this study was aimed at evaluating the alterations in haematological parameters of cervical cancer subjects in Port Harcourt. The authors considered that this study will serve as a solution to possible complications that may arise in the diagnosis, treatment, and management of cervical cancer patients in Port Harcourt.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the abstract is suitable.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract of the article is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The subsections and structure of the manuscript are appropriate.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The text is clear and easy to read. The results are very interesting. The authors considered concluded that that haemoglobin concentration and packed cell volume are both prognostic factors for the management and survival of cervical cancer patients.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The list of references is recently.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	The English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Review Form 3

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:	Dumitru Gabriela
Department, University & Country	Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iasi, Romania