



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>EFFECT OF FALCIPARUM MALARIA ON HAEMATOLOGICAL PARAMETERS IN MALARIA INFECTED PATIENTS IN SOKOTO METROPOLIS</p> <p>I read this manuscript and I think it could be an acceptable text if certain aspects are clarified and corrected. The topic is interesting. In any case, I congratulate the authors for their effort. I suggest that, please, the authors verify the following comments:</p> <p>-Sample and sample size Please provide a flowchart.</p> <p>An opportunistic sample can be acceptable if is clearly stated and the limitations of data are taken into account. When convenience sampling is used, it is necessary to describe how the sample of the current investigation would be different from the ideal sample, selected randomly (from the entire population). It is also necessary to describe individuals who might be left out during the selection process or individuals who are over-represented in the sample.</p> <p>Was the sample size calculated for prevalence? what was the hypothetical value of the prevalence to calculate the sample size?</p> <p>Was the sample size calculated for the comparison of the results between groups (power, etc.)? The authors should provide all the statistical parameters of the sample.</p> <p>-Discussion:</p> <p>The review of the literature should be more than cite the results of other authors. It should also be discussed the strengths and weaknesses of these studies, which should be provided a picture, albeit limited, of the state of knowledge and the main questions on the subject that these studies clarify and left unclear (e.g. by inadequate samples, incorrect design, testing erroneous statistics, characteristics of the persons studied, etc.).</p> <p>-Conclusion:</p> <p>It is important in any scientific paper to point out the problems that, from the current study, are still pending solution or clarification.</p> <p>-References:</p> <p>The references should be quoted, numerically, in the text in correlative order. Review, please, the rules of the Journal. The abbreviations of the journals are invented! For example, British journal of haematology, IS NOT Brit J of Haem !!! but the NLM Title Abbreviation is: Br J Haematol The abbreviations of journals should conform to those of the US National Library of Medicine for Medline / PubMed (available in: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/nlmcatalog/journals)</p> <p>-Keywords</p> <p>For keywords the list of Health Sciences Descriptors terms should be used (Medical Subject Headings, MeSH) of Index Medicus (available in https://meshb.nlm.nih.gov/search)</p>	<p>Thank you Sir/Ma, its provided as suggested</p> <p>20.9% previous prevalence was used in calculating sample size and it was calculated for prevalence</p> <p>All corrections are noted and effected</p> <p>Corrections noted and effected</p>
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



SDI Review Form 1.6

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>	