

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Chemical Science International Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CSIJ_117439
Title of the Manuscript:	Demographic overview for Gulf Countries visitor from Bangladesh and correlation of viral infected, abnormal lever and kidney disease patients with CBC parameters.
Type of the 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.journalcsij.com/index.php/CSIJ/editorial-policy>)

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>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>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>1. Yes, the article is very important to the scientific community.</p> <p>2. Yes, the title of the article is appropriate.</p> <p>3. Yes, the abstract is comprehensive of the article .</p> <p>4. Yes, subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate.</p> <p>5. Yes, the manuscript is scientifically correct.</p> <p>6. NO, the references are insufficient, but it's recent.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes, the English language article is suitable for academic communication .</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>I would like to thank you for choosing me as a reviewer for one of the articles submitted to your journal.</p> <p>The article is good, but there are a few comments:</p> <p>1- The researcher did not clarify the cut-off value for HBsAg, HCV, HIV and TP.</p> <p>2- The researcher did not explain why he relied on SGPT and SGOT only to test of liver function without tests of Bilirubin, Alkaline phosphate, Gamma Glutamyl transferase, Bilirubin, Alpha fetoprotein, Fibro scan lever, Lactate dehydrogenase and ultrasound for whole abdomen.</p> <p>3- The discussion is sparse and was not comprehensive in the entire article, and it needs to add a number of previous results and studies.</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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ahmed Hieran Ramadan AL-Jabery
Department, University & Country	Thi-Qar University, Iraq