



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Hematology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AHRJ_49638
Title of the Manuscript:	CHANGES IN TISSUE ERYTHROPOIETIN AND SOME HAEMATOLOGICAL PARAMETERS IN CHRONIC KIDNEY DISEASE SUBJECTS ON BLOOD TRANSFUSION IN PORT-HARCOURT
Type of the 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>Author did not number the lines in his manuscript to make review easier.</p> <p>Authors detail like address and email to follow the topic.</p> <p>Author should remove the abstract from italics.</p> <p>Author did not mention platelet count in his abstract.</p> <p>Author did not follow the design of the topic of project work, he/she should have designed the work as using 2 set of control(control 1 are CKD without transfusion and 2nd control are healthy patients) since his topic is CKD on Blood Transfusion.</p> <p>Author should have increased his healthy control subjects to about 60 or 80 since they are readily available, using 30 shows laziness.</p> <p>Author should recheck his methodology for sample collection as centrifuging clotted sample will make it heamolysed and note the temperature quoted as it is not up to room temperature.</p> <p>The results should not contain much words, author should edit as all information written for tables 4.1 and 4.2 are already in the table.</p> <p>Author should have drawn a table containing only the heamatological parameters for all the groups and compare them with one another just as done in table 4.2. He/she was quick to jump step by comparing EPO with heamatological parameters.</p> <p>References were not following international standard arrangement, they also need to be in same pattern.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Author should correct the errors of joined words like "assesslevels"</p> <p>Author should cite the name of the referred author(s) before highlighting its index number not as described by [17].</p>	
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:	Awofadeju Stephen Olajide
Department, University & Country	Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria