



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Hematology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AHRJ_44275
Title of the Manuscript:	Does Single/Combined Administration of Tramadol/Viagra has Reversal Effects on Haematological and proinflammatory Cytokines in Male Albino Rats
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	It is a good work, with an acceptable experimental design. To be an excellent paper it is necessary to rewrite and clarify some failed points in Materials and Methods and Discussion Materials and Methods: Point 2.2 please clarify the exact methods to obtain blood samples. The animal slaughtering methods were made in a previous accordance with ethical committee approbation? Please include these ethical approbations. Point 2.3: it is not necessary for the paper to explain the automatic counter machine function Discussion: please rewrite and clarify the exact mechanism form which some group of experimental animals show platelets count and other haematological indexes alterations. This point is not clear for the lecturer and/or reviewer	I agree with the review done so far and all suggestions have been effected. The animal slaughtering method was made in accordance with previous research work done by Nna <i>et al</i> , (2016). Point 2.3 as reviewed is corrected as suggested. I agree with the suggestion on discussion. And the suggestion have been effected as reviewed.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> 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)	No, there are no ethical issues in this manuscript.