



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Blood Research &amp; Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_42009
Title of the Manuscript:	PREVALENCE OF GLUCOSE-6-PHOSPHATE DEHYDROGENASE DEFICIENCY AMONG NEONATES IN USMANU DANFODIYO UNIVERSITY TEACHING HOSPITAL (UDUTH), SOKOTO, NIGERIA: TOTAL ANTIOXIDANT CAPACITY AND LIPID PEROXIDATION IN G6PD DEFICIENT NEONATES
Type of the Article	This article is derived from a clinical-epidemiological investigation.

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p>1. Line 77: It is correct to refer to reference 12 for the purposes of sample size, but in the current document at least the statistical and epidemiological parameters and their values must be stated, which were used to calculate the sample size. Is the sample chosen for convenience or at random? If it was random, how was it proceeded? Ethnic issues should be included in the description of the sample.</p> <p>2. The current content of the Discussion is appropriate from the technical point of view, but it is very poor from the epidemiological and scientific point of view. Why? Because it is dedicated to repeat what is known in the world about G6PD and about the frequency of the deficiency of that enzyme in different countries, but it omits completely to refer to Nigeria and African countries that share many genetic and epidemiological aspects with Nigeria. What is the agreement or disagreement of the results with others known for Nigeria and African countries? A quick search in Pubmed ("Glucosephosphate Dehydrogenase Deficiency"[Majr] and Nigeria) allows to find references such as, for example, the following ones, which are almost all omitted in the manuscript and many of those references refer to neonates. I suggest, in a respectful way, that the authors focus their discussion 1) to compare their results with those of other works in Nigeria and African countries; 2) to analyze their data according to the epidemiology of G6PD-deficiency in Nigeria and similar countries; 3) to point out the strengths and weaknesses of their research (which are not indicated anywhere) and, 4) with less intensity, to repeat what is already known about the enzyme and its behavior in other non-African countries. This new approach will provide not only the G6PD deficiency data in Nigeria to the scientific world, along with the TACs and other measurements, but it will allow an adequate interpretation and perspective of such data.</p>	<p>The study design was a prospective observational study.</p> <p>This has been discussed from line 120 to line 125</p> <p>We have taken care of these observations</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	I suggest that the concepts of Total antioxidant capacity and Lipid peroxidation be presented in a very summarized form, and that their relationship with the G6PD-deficiency be enunciated.	It has been addressed.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p>The manuscript is of global interest and its content, once the Discussion has been improved, will help in an important degree to advance the knowledge of the problem in Nigeria.</p> <p>I ask the Journal to publish the work when it is adjusted and to encourage the authors to accept these respectful and cordial sugestions.</p>	