



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	MS: 2012_IJTDH_2948
Title of the Manuscript:	Sickle Cell Trait (HbAS) is Associated with Increased Expression of Erythrocyte Complement Regulatory Proteins CR1 and CD55 in Children

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: 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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Fig.5 Age 13-17 not shown (is this an omission)	done
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Line 310, 320, 327, 332, 334, To read CD55 instead of CD Figure 2 assumes that the reader will know that the key is the same as Figure 1. Figure 3. If the legends and heading talks of cell "under reduced Oxygen" different whisker boxes patterns should be used to avoid confusing the reader between the result in figure 1 and that of figure 2 Figure 5. The author should give an indication that the key in Figure 4 is still the same for this figure so that the reader realises that this has further been broken down into the said age cohorts. Figure 6. Is has minor issues just like what has been indicated for Figure 3 above. The two statements from line 294 ending at (...cohorts are presented.) in line 296 should be re written as they carry the same information. The line 297 and 298 should state or include both the mean values and Stdev .	This has been corrected Key already in built Whisker pattern changed Whisker pattern changed Whisker pattern changed This has been revised Done
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	I am a bit concerned that In the authors' introduction under line 146 starting.... Although complement....ending	Left intact



SDI Review Form 1.6

	at line 148 reading....SMA. When this is read together with line 134 to 135 the aim of this study does not come out clearly even though they go ahead and state what their intentions are from line 148 to 154. Looking at the study design and methodology, I am aware that this is a nested study and that the population in question could be the same but I would be worried if I copied the whole method word to word paragraph to paragraph from a previous work which has already been published (referenced in the manuscript as ref 51 by the same authors). I would use the same information but presented differently while referencing the mother publication. Lastly in the discussion the authors discuss and give possible hypotheses about the high mean CR1 copy number in HbAS at normal Oxygenation and a high CD55 ABC for the same age group and phenotype a after deoxygenation. However, they fail to discuss the mean copy numbers of the same age group 49-192 months at deoxygenation and CD55 ABC at normal oxygenation. Are the authors surprised with their finding or were they expecting this. From their observation my personal take in this is that I tend to think that these are complementing each other; one covering during deoxygenation and the other taking charge under normal oxygenation. It's a good manuscript that has general good flow from title, capturing a good introduction of the subject methods and result, discussion and conclusion. If these few remarks could be reviewed it could possibly be published.	Done Noted and discussion widened
--	---	---