Journal Name:	Asian Hematology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_AHRJ_61671**
Title of the Manuscript:	**SICKLE CELL HEPATOPATHY: PREVALENCE AND PRESENTATION IN CHILDREN WITH SICKLE CELL ANEMIA SEEN IN ENUGU STATE UNIVERSITY TEACHING HOSPITAL, PARKLANE, ENUGU.**
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/journal/10/editorial-policy)

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	**1.** Ohe abstract must contain a maximum of 300 words, according to the rules of the journal. "It should not exceed 300 words in length. It should briefly describe the purpose of the work, techniques and methods used, major findings with important data and conclusions". **2.** I recommend the authors to add in the introduction the need for a study of this nature, so it will validate and justify the execution of the study. In the last paragraph, present the objective of the study. **3.** In the methods. The authors do not mention whether the study was approved by an ethics committee. If the country does not require approval from an ethics committee for this study, mention in the methodology, if required, the authors must mention that the study passed through an ethics committee and was accepted and developed and make the authorization copy available as material additional. **4.** The tables must be organized according to their respective results being mentioned in the text. Please correct this for all tables. After mentioning a result, illustrate with the respective table. **5.** About the Tables. The paper mentions table, however the illustrated format is "data frame". Suppress the lateral borders so that they become "Tables". Authors must correct this mistake. Do for all. **6.** The authors state that they have few reports on sickle cell anemia in children, however, they have a range of studies on sickle cell anemia. I suggest the authors read this study and add in their discussion to enrich the paper https://doi.org/10.25248/reas.e2774.2020 **7.** Why didn't the authors add the completion topic? I suggest that the authors add this topic as requested by the Journal rules (https://www.journalahrj.com/index.php/AHRJ/about/submissions#authorGuidelines) [Web link]. I suggest that you discuss the main observations made, bringing the main symptoms observed in the patients and the result that the study obtained. Thus, the innovative aspect of the paper is reported. **8.** Authors must place the paper in the formatting rules of the journal.	• 1. The **abstract** has been reduced to 291 words. • The aim, method, major findings, important data and conclusions are included in the **abstract**. • 2. The need for a study of this nature has been added in the **introduction.** The objective of the study has also been presented in the last paragraph of the **introduction** section. • 3. The ethical approval has been mentioned in the **methodology** section. The authorization copy will be made available as **additional material.** • 4. The tables have been organized according to their respective results when mentioned in the text. Results when mentioned are immediately followed by the respective illustrating tables in the **result** section • 5. ALL illustrated formats have been changed from 'data frame' to 'Tables' in the **result** section. • 6. The author was and referring to few reports **on '**Sickle cell hepatopathy' and **not** 'sickle cell anaemia'.
Minor REVISION comments	The paper has a good contribution, however, it needs further revisions in order to be considered suitable for publication. I suggest to the Journal that if the suggested revisions are made, the paper becomes attractive to the scientific community and I recommend its publication.	7. Completion topic has been added. 8. The manuscript has been formatted according to the rules of the journal. 9. Thank you. The paper has been revised as recommended.

Optional/General comments		

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)* Yes, and your authorization must be mentioned in the methodology. So, how to make a copy of the document available to the Journal. Except, if the country in question does not require authorization from an ethics committee for observational patient studies.	