



**SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM**

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p>Comments on the manuscript "Platelet Indices and Antiphospholipid Syndrome in Patients with Recurrent Pregnancy Loss"</p> <p>The paper proposes the use of platelet indices to detect patients at risk for repeated pregnancy loss. This is a worthwhile scientific enquiry that proposes the use of often-neglected but routinely-generated laboratory data. The manuscript would have been easier to review if line numbers were inserted. This notwithstanding, the following are points to attend to:</p> <p>a. "Anti-cardiolipin" needs to be consistently spelt correctly, with no capitalization in the middle and correctly hyphenated.</p> <p>b. Compound words should also be appropriately hyphenated</p> <p>c. There's need to spell-check the entire document and edit for grammar, especially subject/verb agreement.</p> <p>d. There is no need to abbreviated "antibodies" to Abs, especially where the abbreviation occurs only once in the entire document.</p> <p>e. There is a concern that the 50 participants with APS conveniently fell into 25+ve for LAC abs and 25 negative for same. Were these selected from a pool of data? If so, what was the rationale for exclusion of the other pieces of data?</p> <p>f. P-value is enough to determine significance. There is no need to state whether a P-value is significant in the last column of Table 1.</p> <p>g. Also, it would be helpful if the PLT was included in Tables 1 and 3.</p> <p>h. Need to clarify if the categorization of subjects was based on LAC/aCL, or APS. The manuscript seems to suggest both.</p> <p>i. What are LA1 and LA2?</p> <p>j. Authors may consider stating the cut-off value as a single point (eg, 8.4) rather than a range (&gt;8.4).</p> <p>k. Authors may consider revising the phrase "possess a necessary role" to read "contribute to the pathogenesis of ..."</p> <p>l. The rest of the comments are on the manuscripts.</p> <p>With these addressed, the paper may be considered for publication.</p>	<p>a- Anti-cardiolipin was revised all through the manuscript</p> <p>b- Antibodies was corrected</p> <p>c- Last column of table (1) was omitted</p> <p>d- I need a clarification about the comment on table 1 and 3 what is needed to be added? Does the editor mean to add PLT count to table 1 and 3 or what? What is meant by PLT included in table 1 and 3? PLT count or PLT indices?</p> <p>e- Subjects were categorized into positive and negative for APS according to their LAC and aCL results. Since LAC and aCL are the laboratory diagnostic criteria of APS, then patients who are positive or negative for LAC and aCL were assigned to positive for APS and negative for APS respectively.</p> <p>f- LA1 is the screening dRVVT reagent and LA2 is the confirmatory dRVVT reagent</p> <p>g- The cut-off values were revised</p> <p>h- The phrase "possess a necessary role" was corrected to "contribute to the pathogenesis of"</p> <p>i- The medical records of patients with recurrent pregnancy loss, who were admitted to the obstetrics clinic of Ain Shams University hospitals in Egypt were reviewed. After application of exclusion criteria, such as patients with a known history of chronic diseases, immobilization, surgery, trauma during pregnancy, uterine abnormalities, fever or proven infection in the first trimester, smokers and those used non-steroid anti-inflammatory drugs or anti-coagulants were excluded and 50 patients included in the study. After reviewing the medical records the first 25 patients who were positive for APS were selected to be enrolled in the study, and as well the first 25 patients who were negative for APS were also selected both fulfilling the exclusion criteria. However, LAC and aCL testing were done again for both groups to confirm the results in patients records with repetition of testing after 3 months for the positive group (as recommended by ISTH).</p> <p>j- Spelling and grammar check was done for the manuscript</p>