

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Biology & Biotechnology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JABB_112665
Title of the Manuscript:	PLASMA EXCHANGES: OBSERVATIONAL STUDY AT THE MOHAMMED V RABAT MILITARY TRAINING HOSPITAL BLOOD TRANSFUSION CENTER FROM JANUARY 2016 TO DECEMBER 2019
Type of the Article	Clinical Practice Article

Review Form 1.7

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>In the abstract, it would be helpful to briefly mention the key findings of your study. What were the main results or insights obtained from your analysis?</p> <p>Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider expanding the introduction by providing more context about the historical development of plasma exchange as a medical treatment and its significance in contemporary medicine. • Include a clear statement of the research objectives to help readers understand what you aimed to achieve with the study. <p><input type="checkbox"/> Materials and Methods:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specify the total number of patients included in the study. You mention 16 patients, but it's not clear if this represents the entire study population. • Provide more details about the inclusion criteria and how patients were selected for the study. Explain why these particular 16 patients were chosen. • Describe the ethical considerations and approvals, if any, for conducting this retrospective study. <p><input type="checkbox"/> Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider presenting the results in a more organized manner, perhaps using tables or charts to make it easier for readers to understand the data. • Include statistical measures, such as means, medians, and standard deviations, where appropriate to describe the data more effectively. • Clarify the units for the average exchanged volume (AEV). It appears to be given in liters, but the table labels suggest "liters/procedure." • Check for any typographical errors, such as "3700 liters per procedure," which seems unusually high. It's likely a typographical error; please correct it. <p><input type="checkbox"/> Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the discussion section, provide a more detailed explanation of the various indications for plasma exchange and the rationale behind each one. • Consider discussing the limitations of your study, including the small sample size and any potential biases in patient selection. • Expand on the clinical implications of your findings. How can the results of your study influence medical practice or patient care? • Add a conclusion paragraph summarizing the key takeaways from the discussion and their broader implications. 	

Review Form 1.7

4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	It is appropriate	
5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?	Correct	
6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	Sufficient Suggestions given above	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Few grammatical errors	
Optional/General comments	<input type="checkbox"/> Ensure consistency in terminology. For example, you use "PE," "plasma exchange," and "plasmapheresis" interchangeably. Choose one term and stick with it throughout the article. <input type="checkbox"/> Proofread the article for grammatical errors and typos. For instance, "3700 liters per procedure" should be corrected to a more realistic volume (e.g., milliliters). <input type="checkbox"/> Provide more context on the significance of the study's findings in the broader field of transfusion medicine or clinical practice	

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:	Lakshmi Jyothi T
Department, University & Country	AIIMS, India