



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_42073
Title of the Manuscript:	The variation in anemic parameters in the ethnic groups of Pakistan
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	<p>Anaemia is definitely an important topic for discussion mainly in developing countries where preventative medicine is still a matter of concern. However, the paper submitted herewith deserves few comments.</p> <p>Abstract: should be concise, and informative, please consider revising. The way it is written it does not give the exact gist of the study.</p> <p>Introduction: The paper brings two objectives. One being the study of the prevalence of anaemia in diverse ethnic Pakistani groups, and the other would be finding out the association between any genetic inborn issue, or cultural/social cause for anaemia. As a matter of fact, the authors should explore what those variables are in Methodology. Explaining the variables used for genetic inborn issue, cultural, social, and environmental issues, financial status, literacy status etc. items what they swiftly mention in Discussion. Statistical methods are not well explained in Methodology, and it is worth it revising/adding. Since it is a descriptive study, it is not advised to infer any conclusion from the same, but to mention further longitudinal studies are needed. Also, they should explore sample sizing, the limitation of hospital-based sampling, briefly mentioned in Limitation of study, and what the strength of the association if any, as sample size for few groups is too small. Financial status, literacy rate and sanitation are mentioned towards Discussion and Conclusion, although the authors do not explain how they have classifies those variables. Please define ages accordingly. What do you mean by young, middle, and old age group? As mentioned, this kind of study can suggest but not affirm. Conclusion is quite comprehensive and broad, although seems to be taken more further than the study could drive.</p> <p>References are up to date for the topic, however I would recommend to review ena revise according to Journal standards.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	English review is needed. Some sentences are missing capital letters after periods.	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Flavia Miranda Bandeira
Department, University & Country	Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Brazil