

-----Original Message-----

From: XXX YYY<xxx@yyy.zzz>

Sent: Thu, Mar 6, 2014 at 12:14 AM

To: Managing Editor

Subject: Re: Request for evaluation of revised paper, reference number:
2014_IJTDH_8985

Although some changes have been made, unfortunately I cannot recommend publication of this revised manuscript. The main reason is that, regarding sickle cell anemia and iron status indices, we are not learning anything from it.

In addition, although I had already recommended rejection of the original manuscript, I did make detailed comments: however, the recommendations that I thought were most important have not been followed. For instance:

- The dot scattergrams of the original data have not been produced
- There is no answer as to what p .00 means, and such values are still shown.
- The modified discussion still goes on for 4 pages, but it still fails to come up with a clear statement as to whether and what proportion of sickle cell anemia patients have iron deficiency or iron overload.
- As a minor point, the authors have also chosen not to change the confusing nomenclature.

P.S. One last point: I know the University Hospital where this paper comes from because I have worked there for 10 years. I know that: (a) one of the major strengths of the sickle cell clinic is in numbers: they should take advantage of the large clinical load and produce data on 600 sickle cell patients, not 60; (b) they can design a much better study than this one.

Note: Anonymous Reviewer

Note: Modification was done in this email ONLY to hide the identity.