



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Blood Research &amp; Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_50232
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of Blood Storage Effect using CPDA-1 on Packed Cell Volume, Oxyhaemoglobin and Methaemoglobin in Different ABO/Rhesus Blood Types
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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	The the influence of storage on RBC cell properties is an important topic and such researches are clinically meaningful in many aspects. The experiment described by the author(s) is well-performed in general and the manuscript is well-written in general. The major weakness i think is that the sample amount looks not sufficient to some degree, which may lower the repeatability of the results. If it is not possible to add more samples, I suggest the author(s) remind the reader this aspect in discussion.	Samples were obtained in triplicate and we have included it in the manuscript.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Packed Cell Volume should be specified for Red Blood Cells.</li> <li>2. Packed Cell Volume, Packed cell volume, PVC are mixed used. I suggestion a consistent use. PVC should be explained at its first appearance.</li> <li>3. In abstract, "Packed call volume" is incorrect.</li> <li>4. In 2.5.1, "It involved" should be "it involves"</li> <li>5. "4.7" should be "3.7"</li> <li>6. There are too many subsections in section 3. I think subsection 3.2-3.9 can be reorganized.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Corrected</li> <li>2. All have been changed to packed cell volume</li> <li>3. Packed call volume have been corrected in abstract to packed cell volume</li> <li>4. It involved have been corrected to it involves</li> <li>5. 4.7 has been corrected to 3.7</li> <li>6. On the subsections in section 3, please, reorganizing them may not be too reader friendly, please kindly allow us to leave it the way it is.</li> </ol> <p>THANKS FOR A GOOD JOB</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	Informed consent was obtained from all Donors