



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_44667
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of Human Erythrocyte Filterability with Trapping Rate Obtained by Nickel Mesh Filtration Technique: Two Independent Parameters of Erythrocyte Deformability
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	1. In the abstract, the "Aim" seems not aims, but methods. 2. The conclusions have not been evidenced strongly by the results. 3. In the abstract and Introduction, it was said that "the filtration process is not visualized by this nickel mesh filtration technique". However, this paper did not solve the problem. It will make readers confused. 4. In the results, stage 2 scattered from 65% to 96%, the authors should estimate the samples needed statistically. Maybe 8 is not enough and more tests are needed. 5. Figure 3 is not typical to show correlations between two parameters.	1. Exactly, we revised the sentence of Aim in Abstract totally. 2. Yes, the Conclusion was revised totally based on the Results obtained. Aspect of Limitation was added to the final Conclusion. 3. Sorry for confusion. Sentence with this respect was revised in Abstract and Introduction. 4. We understand the rationale of this critique. However, we confirmed the reproducibility and sensitivity of the nickel mesh filtration method in our articles (Refs. 2-7), and 8 samples were enough in previous publication (Refs. 2, 4). Actually, data in step 2 were scattered more than data in step 1, indicating that pore size in step 2 is critical for erythrocyte passage. This was described in Discussion. 5. We accept this critique, but all the data in the present study should be presented honestly. Statistical analysis was mentioned in sentences (Results).
Minor REVISION comments	1. Did the last sentence in "Methods" indicated data analysis? 2. □ and △ are grey in the figure. Please make them the same.	1. This reviewer probably means the cut-off value of probability (p). Authors usually state the rule of statistical data analysis as $p < 0.05$. 2. Sorry, we refined the symbols.
Optional/General comments		We added one more citation as a reference in Discussion.

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	