



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>British Journal of Medicine and Medical Research</u>
Manuscript Number:	2014_BJMMR_11602
Title of the Manuscript:	Sickle Cell Disease in pregnancy: Maternal and fetal Outcome in Port Harcourt, 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	- Large number of screened patients with rather small eligible patients. I would recommend to list more details from these patients history (previous pregnancies, number of documented SS-crisis before pregnancy, associated diseases, etc.) to get a feeling how healthy or sick the affected patients are before pregnancy. - Preeclampsia is per se a risk for small birth weight, did eventually all patients have some degree of preeclampsia (might be good link between SS-disease and oxidative stress) - Conclusion is made in regards to blood transfusion but this hasn't been discussed before. I would strongly recommend the treatment possibilities for SS patients during crisis (hemodilution, antioxidative treatment, exchange transfusion, etc.)	Done Only 2 of patients had preeclampsia and the babies were low birth weight. Blood transfusion removed
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	- Line 137 missing word ...were low birth weights. - Line 143 please correct ... preeclampsia	done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	In general this retrospective review could be an interesting observation but it needs a little bit more meat on the hook. We all know how difficult it is to undertake research in this environment.	