

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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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 article is relevant to the women visiting a hospital at Nigeria and hence can be used as a preliminary data for future genetic assessment with prognostic values of cervical cancer based on their familial history as well. Hematocrit value should also be correlated along with the parameters done in this study Correlation between lymph node metastasis and distant metastasis Discussion should be elaborated to explain why only hemoglobin and PCV are used for prognostic values and why other parameters are of lesser significance	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes	
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.	3mls should be changed to 3ml. Sentences needs to correlated for proper understanding by the readers to convey the exact methodology and results	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The range of age mentioned in the study population (>40 years)is different from inclusion criteria (>18 years) Correct age groups are to be mentioned as used for this study Limitations of previous study in the locality may be discussed to narrate the advantages of the current study	
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.	Mean \pm S.D has been correlated for the studied hematological parameters to assess the mortality rate well in advance to provide effective treatment protocols The blood parameter analysis is an earlier prognostic procedure compared to biopsy protocol The study has a societal benefit for an easier prognosis of cervical cancer	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
Minor REVISION comments	The article needs alterations to correlate the technical terminologies with grammatical changes for lucid presentation	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Explanation may be given for the analysis that is used to evaluate the predictive significance of NLR, PLR, and MLR to discriminate between patients with cancer from healthy subjects, patients with different tumor stages, and patients with or without lymph node metastasis and distant metastasis with Stages I, IIA, IIB, III & IV and hence the rate of survival can also be correlated	

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:	T.M.Vijayalakshmi
Department, University & Country	University of Madras, India