



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Hematology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AHRJ_47124
Title of the Manuscript:	EVALUATION OF THE DIAGNOSTIC VALUE OF Ret-He AMONG SICKLE CELL DISEASE PATIENTS WITH IRON DEFICIENCY ANAEMIA ON HAEMATINICS
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	Please justify using the term "combined RBC indices" or refer to a reference (RBC indices include MCV, MCH and MCHC) Please justify using Iron Deficiency (ID) not Iron Deficiency Anaemia (IDA) all over the article (Iron deficiency anemia (IDA) occurs when ID is sufficiently severe to reduce erythropoiesis) Add the reference for cut off criteria in table 1 especially for ferritin level Table 3: you only measured ferritin to 49 children???? Table 4: you should add a column for transfused children (25 children) and calculate P values again. Line 69: you measured CRP but you did not show the results or discuss the cause of performing this test. Line 127: how would your results suggest "that Ret-He is a better and useful tool in monitoring response to iron supplementation"?	Thank you for your comments. Corrections done.
Minor REVISION comments	Page 1: Abstract: line 14: remove "from venous blood samples" Page 3: line 58: delete "Parental/guardian consent was obtained for participants before they were recruited into the study" as it is repeated in the ethical consideration section Page 4: line 78: the abbreviation will be AUC instead of AU-CROC Table 2: replace 6.573 ± 0.4240 with 6.6 ± 0.4 and all the percentages, it is enough to use one digit (example: 50.6 instead of 50.60). In addition, all the data are shown in the table, there is no need to repeat them in the text. Please apply the same to table 4 Line 92: replace was in "RBC indices 56.2% was" with "were". Line 105: delete "RDW-SD = red cell distribution width - standard deviation" it was not in the table Line 106: delete "ARC = Absolute reticulocyte count" it was not in the table Line 107: you mention "†Mean values and unpaired t test." where is † in the table? Line 121: explain or rephrase: The combined red cell indices (MCV, Hb, MCH, MCHC and RDW) were able to significantly ($p < 0.05$) exclude most of subjects with iron deficiency followed by ferritin and Ret-He". Line 126: replace "predicator" with "predictor". Line 117: Ret-Hb has been used for more than 15 years in hematology lab....so I think "relatively new parameter" would not be the correct description. Line 153 : replace "is" with "are". Line 157: Conclusion should be constructed on the article results. You did not monitor response to haematinics so please delete "aid in the monitoring of response to iron supplementation therapy in IDA patients".	
Optional/General comments	Either use: p is lowercase and italicized OR P is upper case and not italicized	

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)	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>