

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_116583
Title of the Manuscript:	RHD GENOTYPING TO RESOLVE WEAK AND DISCREPANT RHD PHENOTYPES : THE “SERENISSIMA” EXPERIENCE
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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>It is a good research article, significantly showing the importance of weak D detection. It can aid in diagnosing the actual D phenotype of patients.</p> <hr/> <p>Title can be better like Unveiling RHD Complexity: Genotyping Solutions for Weak and Conflicting RHD Phenotypes, THE “SERENISSIMA” EXPERIENCE</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Top of Form</p> <hr/> <p>Abstract has grammatical issues. Highlighted few, can be better rewritten</p> <p>Yes they are appropriate</p> <p>Yes it is correct</p> <p>Yes references are appropriate.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>No. It needs rephrasing.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>Results are very logically analysed but not written properly. For a reader, they should be written in a better way. Moreover, it can also be mentioned that what was the age group of patients? What was the diagnosis of patients? From which speciality majority of positive cases (like Gynae, Medicine etc) were seen.</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>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Samra Waheed
Department, University & Country	Dow University of Health Sciences, Pakistan