

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Hematology Research Journal</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AHRJ_125186
Title of the Manuscript:	Incidence of Leukaemia and Coagulation Profile Assessment in Sickle Cell Patients at Sickle Cell Foundation, Lagos University Teaching Hospital, Lagos
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> 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>
<p>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.</p>	<p><b>Peer Review Comments: Manuscript Number:2024_AHRJ_125186</b></p> <p><b>Ambiguity in Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The exclusion criteria include "pregnant women with sickle cell disease," but it's unclear why pregnancy itself is a factor, as pregnancy in SCD patients is a common research subject. Providing a brief justification for excluding pregnant women would clarify this choice.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sample Size Justification:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no mention of how the sample size (n=80) was determined. A statistical justification for the sample size (e.g., based on power analysis or previous studies) should be included to show the adequacy of the study's design for drawing meaningful conclusions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Inconsistent Measurement Units:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is inconsistency in using symbols for degrees (e.g., °C is missing in some sections). For example, "37°c" in section 2.5.6 should be "37°C" for proper formatting.</li> </ul> <p><b>Unclear Transport Conditions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In section 2.4, the transport of blood samples is mentioned as being under "cold chain conditions," but no specific temperature range is provided. Clarifying the temperature range would ensure the reproducibility of the methodology.</li> </ul> <p><b>Inconsistent and Redundant Descriptions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sections 2.5.7 and 2.5.8 describing ELISA techniques for fibrinogen and D-dimer assays are almost identical. This redundancy could be streamlined to avoid unnecessary repetition, while clearly differentiating between the two assays.</li> </ul> <p><b>Typographical and Formatting Issues:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are some minor typographical errors and formatting inconsistencies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"370c" instead of "37°C" (2.5.5)</li> <li>"APTT (seconds) 0.935" should specify that this is a p-value, for clarity.</li> <li>In section 2.6.2, "Python," should not have a comma at the end of the subheading.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Statistical Reporting and Interpretation:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In several sections (e.g., 3.2.3, 3.2.4, 3.2.5), while discussing p-values, results like "not statistically significant" should clarify the threshold for significance (e.g., "p &gt; 0.05" or an explicitly stated cut-off).</li> <li>The t-statistics and corresponding p-values mentioned in Section 3.5 and Section 3.6 should be discussed in more depth. For example, why were some t-tests significant while others were not? This could reflect a type II error due to small</li> </ul>	

**Review Form 3**

	<p>sample sizes, which should be acknowledged if applicable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 3.7 references correlation values but should include explicit guidance on interpreting the strength of correlations (e.g., what range of correlations are considered strong, moderate, or weak). Additionally, the inclusion of confidence intervals for these correlations could be helpful for precision.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>		
<p><b>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.</b></p>		
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>		
<p><b>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.</b></p>		
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b></p>		
<p><u>Minor REVISION</u> comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>		
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>		

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<p><b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b></p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Tanwangini Sahani</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>India</b>