



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJR2H_56154
Title of the Manuscript:	Fibrous splenomegaly and Gaucher disease
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>)



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	<p>The authors described a patient with Type 1 Gaucher disease, who underwent splenectomy because of symptomatic marked splenomegaly. This report is somewhat interesting and instructive for hematologists because of the rarity of this disease. However, this manuscript contains many problems as scientific case report.</p> <p>Major comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The diagnosis of Gaucher disease is not confirmed in this report. A: the level of angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE) or acid phosphatase (ACP) should be described. B: The Gaucher cell in the bone marrow and the spleen should be shown. Figure 1 is not necessary, instead, Gaucher cell in the bone marrow and the histologic picture of the spleen are needed. 2. The authors stated "fibrous splenomegaly" in the Title; however, fibrous histologic feature is not shown in this manuscript. 3. The platelet count before the splenectomy was 9000/mm³, how was the operation was performed? Was the platelet transfusion performed before the splenectomy? 4. The authors should describe the outcome of the intravenous treatment with glucocerbrosidase. 5. The Discussion section of scientific article is not the description of textbook. In this section, the authors should describe, for example, the diagnostic problem of the present patient, indication of the splenectomy, risk of bleeding, the significance of the fibrosis of the spleen, outcome of the glucocerbrosidase treatment, etc. 	
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Minor comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. English writing and medical description of this manuscript are poor. The authors should correct. 2. A 45-year-old patient→A 45-year old male 3. In the laboratory findings, the value of C-reactive protein (CRP) is needed. 4. 11.4 g.dl→11.4 g/dL 5. White blood cells increased to 18200 ele/mm³→white blood cells increased to 18.2×10⁹/L in number. Please describe the differential count of WBC. 6. Platelet at 9000/mm³→platelet at 9.0×10⁹/L 	
Optional/General comments	None	

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:	Takayuki Takahashi
Department, University & Country	Japan