



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JPRI_62172
Title of the Manuscript:	HAEMATOLOGICAL PROFILE IN CLINICALLY SUSPECTED CASES OF NEONATAL SEPSIS
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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p>	<p>Aim and Objectives : Aim and objectives separately not necessary. It is better to omit 'Aim of Study'. Objective should be precise, specific and relevant to the title of the study. Please check for the modified form of objectives. Do you agree? If yes, you need to correct it.</p> <p>Review of literature: As per the journal standard 'Review of literature' separately is not necessary. It should be incorporated into the part of 'Discussion'. Discussion should be based on the findings/results of this study and its similarities/dissimilarities with other studies.</p> <p>Results: Result seems to be incomplete in the following areas; haematological profile which is the core part of this study is not shown in the result, it must be included. Changes in haematological profile in relation to sepsis should be included which was mentioned in Aims/Objectives. Correlation between haematological profile with blood culture and CRP should be shown in result which was mentioned in Objectives. In Table 1, column 3, age range was mentioned 7-30 days. Neonate means age up to 28 days. Do you agree? If yes, you need to correct it. There is also discrepancy of age range between the table and the description below (Brick highlights).</p> <p>Conclusion: Should be clear and specific based on the findings or results. Recommendations can be included in short.</p> <p>References: Please follow Vancouver methods appropriately</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p>	<p>Abstract: Abstract is concise. There are some problems that need to be corrected.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Inappropriate use of capital letter and small letter (Yellow highlights) 2) Inappropriate use of present tense and past tense (Red highlights) 3) Repetition of similar words/sentence (Blue highlights) <p>Keywords:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4) Inappropriate use of capital letter and small letter (Yellow highlights) 5) Similar type of key words (Blue highlights) <p>Introduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6) Introduction can be elaborated. It should include discussion on three major aspects: neonatal sepsis, Rodwell's haematological scoring system and haematological parameters, blood culture and CRP in relation to sepsis 7) Repetition of similar words/sentence (Blue highlights) 8) Grammatical and other corrections (Brick highlights) <p>Materials and Methods:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9) Inappropriate use of capital letter and small letter (Yellow highlights) 10) Inappropriate use of present tense and past tense (Red highlights) 11) Repetition of similar words/sentence (Blue highlights) 	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	12) Grammatical and other corrections(Brick highlights) 13) Few sentences on blood culture and culture media should be included	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Md. Mozammel Haque
Department, University & Country	Bangladesh