

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Research Journal of Mathematics
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARJOM_123344
Title of the Manuscript:	MORPHOLOGICAL FACTORS AND FORCES ACTING IN NORMAL AND SICKLED ERYTHROCYTES IN SICKLE CELL ANAEMIA: A MATHEMATICAL MODEL
Type of the 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.	Yes of course, I like this type of research work and it is very helpful and creative area, in coupling of hematological idea and mathematics facts maybe help in advance understanding in pathogenesis and roll of coming events after supportive or really therapeutic discipline.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	It's representative but the normal RBCs it is not clearly involved in the research.	
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.	I guess more organized that is helping the reader to discover the all research points and areas.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	It's ok but the sectioning more reliable than one body structure.	
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.	The topic in this manuscript is very informative about the disease.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments	Yes it is suitable.	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments	Finally it is very interesting topic with very sensitive information, but i guess if there was more graphical figures to support the manuscript candidate participants.	

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:	Elteleb Gafer Elnaim Abdullah
Department, University & Country	Eldaein University, Sudan