



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_IJTDH_4759
Title of the Manuscript:	BIOCHEMICAL PARAMETERS OF UMBILICAL CORD BLOOD IN NIGER DELTA, NIGERIA: TOWARDS ENSURING EFFICIENT CORD BLOOD STEM CELL TRANSPLANTATION.
Type of the Article	Research paper

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 7 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	The research article fits the scope of the journal. It is globally well-written (some misspelling shall be however corrected at almost every page) and the problematic is clear, but still too basic research. The topic is quite interesting, especially considering the implantation of CBU in developing countries. However, the limited data do not fully support the conclusions (e.g. hyperK+), which shall be drawn very carefully. Please clarify by a clear graph. I recommend that the biochemical analysis shall be further complemented by immune-genetic analysis of the samples (maybe an extra paper?) The references are fine but must be better formatted (e.g. journal's title in italics for all references). Please add this key reference: Shahrokri S, Mena F, Alimoghaddam K, McGuckin C, Ebtakar M: Insights and hopes in umbilical cord blood stem cell transplantations. <i>J Biomed Biotechnol.</i> 2012; 572821. Eventually, did you inform the patients about such study and formally got their consent, respecting the international ethical guidelines (e.g. Helsinki Convention)?	Thank you sir for taking time out to review my manuscript. Most of the observations made by the reviewer have been responded to: The spellings have been corrected, histogram has been added to further support the hyperkalaemia. The references have been further formatted with all the titles written in italics, and an additional reference added as advised. The consent obtained from the pregnant women during the study has been included, we hope to complement the biochemical analysis with immune-genetic analysis in future. Generally, the manuscript has been corrected to meet the specification of your journal



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		