



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Hematology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AHRJ_48529
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECT OF FALCIPARUM MALARIA ON HAEMATOLOGICAL PARAMETERS IN MALARIA INFECTED PATIENTS IN SOKOTO METROPOLIS
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>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

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	<p>The theme is interesting. I have some advice.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract: "One hundred and fifty four (254) patients": Is this "two hundred"? Please be very careful regarding the number. If I did not recognized this, this paper would have become a "wrong paper". Please be very careful to write a scientific paper. English should be extensively revised by a native scientific paper-writer. 2. Abstract: "Out of the 254 patients, 167 (65.7%) had malaria.": What are the criteria used to pick up 254 patients. 254 what? 3. Introduction: "Malaria infected patients tended to have significantly lower platelets, WBCs, lymphocytes, eosinophils, RBCs and Hb level, while monocyte and neutrophil counts were significantly higher in comparison to non-malaria infected patients [7]": This is unclear because both neutrophils and eosinophils belong to WBC. 4. "While the vast majority of severe malaria and related mortality is caused by <i>P. falciparum</i> infection [9].": Please reconfirm this sentence. This makes no sense and grammatically incorrect. "While A is B, C is D." 5. Materials: "The study was hospital based cross sectional and involved patients of all ages attending the outpatient clinics who were referred by the resident clinician": Do you mean that patients were tentatively diagnosed as having malaria? Inclusion criteria what? Or does "patients" mean "all patients visiting this clinic"? 6. 2-4-2; I believe that this is a routine procedure. If so, please delete all these detailed statements. 7. Discussion: Please describe if 1) some new findings were made or 2) this study was "reconfirmation" of the previous study regarding the platelet, Hb, and WBC counts. I cannot understand which was the case, 1) or 2). Please definitely state which was the case, 1) or 2). 8, Discussion should be much more concise. You only found out peripheral blood changes in this condition. 	<p>Thank you very much sir/ma. These are all valid observations and they are well noted and corrected.</p> <p>Sir, this study was more of reconfirmation of the previous studies regarding the Plt, WBC and Hb and I have stated it under each of the affected parameter.</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

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?	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	