



**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      |   |

**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 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The title of paper reflects two objectives. Kindly change the title to a more straightforward and focused title. Is focus on prevalence of G-6-PD among the neonates or oxidative stress biomarkers in G-6-PD deficient neonates? The title could carry both but in a clearer manner.</li> <li>2. In result section of abstract, results of bilirubin, TAC and MDA are presented in a confusing manner. State results for G-6-PD deficient and then for G-6-PD normal separately for easier understanding for the reader. Lines 21 and 22.</li> <li>3. Table 2 could be put in a better way or perhaps a graphical representation will show gender distribution within both G-6-PD deficient and G-6-PD normal neonates better, showing percentage distribution of each gender in each G-6-PD group.</li> <li>4. Indicate the cut off values for your parameters (bilirubin, TAC and MDA). This will help to show level of increase or decrease in these parameters in the two groups</li> <li>5. It will be good to add a few sentences in your discussion explaining why MDA level was found to be slightly higher in the G-6-PD deficient neonates compared with the G-6-PD normal and why TAC was higher in the G-6-PD normal compared with the G-6-PD deficient.</li> </ol> | <p>We have agreed to modify the title as suggested. It has been modified in the manuscript.</p> <p>The way the result is presented presently is the best. It compares each parameter in deficient neonates and neonates. At a glance the reader will see the difference.</p> <p>It is still acceptable the way it is. It could either be in bar chart or table, we prefer table.</p> <p>Reference value is not important here since we are dealing with normal neonates (G6PD normal) which serve as a control group and patients (G6PD deficient neonates). Any difference in the result was as a result of G6PD deficiency.</p> <p>It has already been mentioned.</p> |
| <b>Minor</b> REVISION comments      | <p>Choose one abbreviation for Glucose-6-Phosphate Dehydrogenase. Either G-6-PD or G6PD throughout the manuscript.</p> <p>Do not interchange G-6-PD normal group with control group. If neonates with normal G-6-PD activity are serving as control, then kindly state that before using "control".</p> <p>Check for grammatical errors in text.<br/>Line 37- write out RBC(red blood cells) before the abbreviation.<br/>Line 40- write out PPP (pentose phosphate pathway) before using the abbreviation in line 47<br/>Line 53-hemolytic or haemolyzed in line 52, hyperbilirubinaemia in line 57 etc? Stick to one style of spelling.<br/>Line 62- rephrase, cerebral palsy among infants in Nigeria, not Nigeria infants.<br/>Line 76- from the mother of each neonate<br/>Line 91- of the 300 neonates, 90(30%).....<br/>Line 110- table heading. Capitalize first letter of each word</p>   | <p>It has been addressed as suggested. G6PD has been adhered to.</p> <p>It has been addressed. G6PD normal neonates served as control group</p> <p>Grammatical error has been checked.<br/>It has been addressed.<br/>It has been addressed</p> <p>Haemolytic is the correct word as it is. Hyberbilirubinaemia has been used all through now.<br/>It has been corrected.<br/>It has been corrected.<br/>It is good as it is.<br/>All the table headings have corrected accordingly</p>   |



SDI Review Form 1.6

|                                  |   |                            |
|----------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
|                                  | Line 150- this is consistent with studies by ---- and ----- | .<br>It has been addressed |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments |   |                            |