



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Annual Research & Review in Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_ARRB_57971
Title of the Manuscript:	CHANGES IN THE PULMONARY FUNCTIONS OF INDIVIDUALS WITH SICKLE CELL DISEASE: A SCOPING REVIEW.
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/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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ In the introduction, some sentences have no reference. Such as:<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. "Despite the various advances in medicine, the current life expectancy of individuals with sickle cell disease is still suboptimal".2. "It is essential to recognize that SCD can affect health profiles in variable ways. The literature discussing changes in the pulmonary functions of ISCD most often only relates to a specific location, mostly based on small sample sizes, and is usually limited to a particular age range making it difficult to generalize it to the population of ISCD".3. "There is a paucity of studies examining the correlates of pulmonary functions with the various health profiles of individuals with sickle cell disease in a comprehensive fashion. This leaves an unmet need for the care of ISCD. Physiotherapist involved in the management of SCD patients is often faced with the challenge of engaging these patients in strenuous physical activities and also targeting the safe level of exercise to recommend and administer to these patients"✓ The search strategy is flawed.<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Improper choice of words such as "lungs". By choosing the word "lung" more related articles were found.2. General words and phrases such as "need" have been used, which has led to a wide range of searches and away from the main concept.3. Some keywords overlap, such as sickle cell anemia.4. Some synonyms are not similar. Such as need, disorder, impact,...✓ The research question should be written in the form of one comprehensive and complete question. Don't write the main question of your research in several parts.✓ Mention the date of the search.✓ Mention how to search databases in the search strategy.✓ In the Prisma table, the sum of records found electronic databases and records found through other source is 2460.✓ References must be corrected.<p>References do not match the given reference text. For example "Eduard J. van Beers et al., (2014)" not available in article references.</p><ol style="list-style-type: none">a. "Cardiomegaly and relative small chest size were explained to be important causes of the reduced lung volumes and diffusion capacity in SCD."The above reference is related to this sentence, but another reference reported in article.b. "In children with SCA, AHR is prevalent. Younger age, serum IgE concentration and LDH level, a marker of hemolysis, is associated with AHR. Children with SCD have low Vitamin D status, increased susceptibility to respiratory infections, asthma and a greatly heightened vulnerability to potentially fatal complications of respiratory disorders" <u>reference is incorrect. Reference 36 is for this sentence, not 45.</u>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>It is better to explain about the process of pulmonary injury in patients with sickle cell in the introduction.</p> <p>You considered both children and adults. It is better to report only one case. Specify your review range.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ This is a good article. But researchers need to review the search strategy. As a result, there may be little change in the results. ✓ References need to be reviewed. <p>The cases of plagiarism must be corrected. My facilities for checking plagiarism were limited. Please check in this regard.</p>	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Mehrnaz Ahmadi
Department, University & Country	School of Nursing and Midwifery, Ahvaz Jundishapur University of Medical Sciences, Iran