



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_33813
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFECTS OF TOBACCO CIGARETTE SMOKING ON SOME HAEMATOLOGICAL PARAMETERS OF MALE CIGARETTE SMOKERS IN SOUTHERN NIGERIA.
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>)



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	This manuscript examines and compares haematological parameters among the male smokers and non-smokers of Calabar metropolis of Cross River State, South-South Nigeria. The authors report significant difference in the average measurements of haematological parameters between smokers and non-smokers. There are major questions that remain unanswered regarding the study design, analytic approach, and demographics of the study population. 1. Table describing and comparing the demographic variable of the two groups is missing. 2. Study design: Based on the authors' description the study design seems murky. This falls in the domain of case-control study, however the authors seem unaware of it. On the recruitment of 150 smokers (cases) and 110 non-smokers (controls), the authors have failed to justify these numbers. Is it a case of convenience sampling/recruitment? How were the smokers and non-smokers recruited? How were the controls matched to cases? What are the justifications for failing to do at least 1-1 matching? 3. Analytic approach: "Descriptive statistics and t-tests were performed to access mean values and significant difference..." Statements such as these are vague and hard to decipher. The authors must report what descriptive statistics were reported. Based on table, mean and	1. Table bearing demographic variables has been added and upgraded as table 1 while the initial table 1 became table 2. Edited and corrected areas have been highlighted in red. 2. The minimum sample size for the test subjects was 138 using $N = Z\alpha^2 PQS/d^2$, hence, the 150. Convenience sampling was applied to the control group as some of the original control subjects were excluded in the study as some were found out to have gone through one treatment or another close to test period. 3. The statements have been corrected and highlighted in red.



SDI Review Form 1.6

	standard deviation are reported. However mean can give a distorted representation of average if the distribution of data is highly skewed. The authors must provide clarification. Most importantly, the authors have reported using t-test. This is an incomplete statement. More than one type of t-test exists. Please clarify the type of t-test used (two sample or paired). A 95% confidence interval must also be reported. The distributional assumptions regarding the use of t-test must also be checked and if violations are observed, non-parametric tests must be used. 4. Interpretation: The authors have overstated the findings. T-test as used by authors compared average/mean across the two groups. This must be reflected in the interpretation. Statements such as "... cigarette smokers had significantly higher hemoglobin" does not make sense. I believe the authors are referring to the average hemoglobin. 5. Specifying the alpha-level: The alpha level must be specified in the material and methods section before any analysis has been performed. The authors have used the commonly used threshold of 0.05 which must be stated in the methods section.	4. The statement has been corrected appropriately and highlighted in red. 5. The alpha level has been inserted and highlighted.
--	---	---



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Some of the terms used by the authors seem nebulous and warrant more elaboration. Page 1, Line 16; Page 2, Line 52 and 55: Please clarify what you mean by “apparently healthy”. What was so apparent here? Typos: 1. The title uses the term “Haematological”, however throughout the manuscript the authors consistently use the term “hematology”. 2. Page 2, Line 42: “More so, cigarette smoking accelerate pathogenesis” – accelerates. 3. Page 2, Line 43: “Similarly it changes the pH in stomach that result in” – results. 4. Page 2, Line 45-46: This is not true for all low-income countries. The authors should be more specific to which countries they are referring to.	Apparently healthy refers to a clinical stand when an individual is assessed to be healthy by only physical examination and clacking/questioning of the subjects without subjecting them prior to routine clinical tests. Claiming total health would equate using a 100% confidence interval in statistics. 1. Haematology in the title has been reverted to hematology as in other part of the text. The authors prefer the American spelling. 2. “s” has been added to accelerate and is highlighted in red in the manuscript. 3. “s” has been added to result and is highlighted in red in the manuscript. 4. Eact region where the study was performrd has been inserted and highlighted in red.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I would recommend seeking a biostatistician or epidemiologist for support in data analysis and interpretation. Biostatistician and/or epidemiologists must have been included in the study design phase earlier as well. But it is too late to rectify the later.	