



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medical and Pharmaceutical Sciences
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMPS_38784
Title of the Manuscript:	Changes in White Blood Cells Differential associated with adult Malaria-infected Patients
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>)

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	Discussion is to discuss your results not to talk about Malaria, this paragraph can be shifted in the introduction part but not in the discussion part. bone marrow.	
Minor REVISION comments	For me the research is kind of lacking the novelty, for example this article mention about the white blood cells, I know you went more in details to check the deferential WBCs. I expected more in results and discussion parts. Ladhani, S., Lowe, B., Cole, A. O., Kowuondo, K., & Newton, C. R. (2002). Changes in white blood cells and platelets in children with falciparum malaria: relationship to disease outcome. British journal of haematology, 119(3), 839-847. Can you include Human Ethic Number	
Optional/General comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ayah Hilles
Department, University & Country	Department of Physiology, International Islamic University Malaysia, Malaysia