



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Medicine and Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJMAH_44902
Title of the Manuscript:	Haemoglobin Genotype, ABO and Rhesus Blood Group Distribution in Briggs Family of Abonnema, Rivers State, 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>)

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>To authors,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abstract: Touch very shortly Briggs family in abstract. You stated twice "There was no Rhesus D negative cases and haemoglobin SS genotype: Please delete one. 2. Introduction: Readers have no interest in Chief's name of Briggs family. You here should only state that Briggs family is a large tribe in this area. Delete detailed explanation of Briggs family. If Briggs family has been reported to have "peculiar" red blood type, then, detailed explanation for it is necessary. 3. Introduction: Shorten the explanation of ABO and Rh. These are common sense of medicine. 4. At last, the study did not reveal "brand new" findings. Or, is it new in the point that there were NO people with RhD – or HbSS? If the latter is the case, please emphasize this new finding and emphasize its medical/social significance more straightforwardly. If you consider that this (these) is/are not new to the extent that you "emphasize" it (them), then state following: (example) although the present study fundamentally reconfirmed the preexisting data, this detailed description may be of use as basic/fundamental data to further study. In short, DISCERN what is already known vs. not known. If all are already known, then, state the above. State this definitely. Even in the case that this study was a reconfirmation, it is OK. 	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Shigeki Matsubara</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>Jichi Medical University, Japan</i>