

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_123767
Title of the Manuscript:	Storage-Related Haematological and Biochemical Changes in Sickle Cell Trait Donor Blood at Kisumu Regional Blood Transfusion Centre, Kenya
Type of the Article	Original Research 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 study conducted in an area where SCT is very much prevalent. Storage of SCT positive blood involved Biochemical & Hematological changes which are very much important factors for the Recipient. So, all the bloods should be screened for SCT before storage & should be processed accordingly to avoid any complication.	
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.	Abstract of the article is comprehensive.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	YES	
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.	Sample size calculated properly. All the steps were well elaborated. Technical descriptions were well. Data collected at interval of 7 days (i.e. 0,7,14,21 & 28 days). Conclusion drawn properly.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient.	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Correct the spelling of Abbott <u>2.4. Laboratory Procedures</u> Bioline Abbott</p> <p>There will be no) after PLT <u>2.6</u> PLT</p>	
Optional/General comments		

Review Form 3

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Supratim Acharjee
Department, University & Country	Agartala Government Medical College, India