



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Hematology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AHRJ_45295
Title of the Manuscript:	Correlating Automated IRIA ESR Analyzer and Westergreen Method for Determination of Erythrocyte Sedimentation Rate
Type of the Article	Original Research 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: (<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Statistical analysis: When evaluating the agreement between two methods, analyzes are used that are not always correct. It is important that in addition to the use of correlation, different statistical tools should be applied in these situations and the methodology should be used in an appropriate manner, including the limits of agreement and their confidence intervals, as well as commenting if the limits found are acceptable differences from the point of view clinical. I suggest using the Bland-Altman concordance analysis.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	The article is well written and based on literature review. It was described in the introduction all the history of attempts of standardization of the ESR test, as well as its last update. It represents a matter of great importance for the laboratories, since the automation in ESR is something growing and fundamental for the dynamics of functioning of great hospitals.	Correction has done
	The Statistical analysis of this article require important corrections because they disqualify the scientific and technical robustness that are imperative for publication	

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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details) Yes. The authors report on the confidentiality of the research, as well as the study was approved by the institution's ethics committee.	