



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	<p>The theme dealt here is important. I have some advice.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract: Ret-He appears without its definition. 2. Abstract: Please define iron deficiency (end point). You wrote something regarding this but it is unclear. Furthermore, diagnostic criteria should be written in Materials and not Result section. 3. Materials: Why did you not use TIBC or serum iron concentration to determine the presence of iron deficiency? Please state the reason why. I assume that iron administration and transfusion prevented these ordinary indices being a marker of iron deficiency. Please explain the situation. 4. Table 3 and its associated explanation are unclear. Please explain things more precisely and in a more reader-friendly manner. 5. You compared three parameters to diagnose "iron deficiency". You state that iron deficiency should be (fundamentally or strictly speaking) diagnosed based on bone marrow findings but it requires time and costs. Then, how did you diagnose the presence/absence of iron deficiency, an end point of this study? The present manuscript does not explain this point well. <p>Native linguistic check is necessary. I wrote something that may improve paper quality.</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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Shigeki Matsubara
Department, University & Country	Jichi Medical University, Japan