

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Research and Reports in Hematology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJR2H_130038
Title of the Manuscript:	Toxicological Effects of Chronic Inhalation Exposure of 2-2 dichlorovinyl dimethyl phosphate on Haematological indices of New Zealand white Rabbits.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>
Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This work is important to illustrate the negative effect of pesticide on animal and human health through studying the changes in blood indices although it didn't offer any solution to ameliorate that negative effect by using any chemical or natural agents which would be of a great scientific value	The study was carried out using rabbits in order to extrapolate the effects in humans. It was observed that subtle exposure to this chemical overtime could result in haematological effects such as bone marrow depression and alteration in other blood indices.
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Toxicological Effects of Chronic Exposure by inhalation of 2-2 dichlorovinyl dimethyl phosphate on Haematological indices of New Zealand white Rabbits.	Toxicological Effects of Chronic Exposure by inhalation of 2-2 dichlorovinyl dimethyl phosphate on Haematological indices of New Zealand white Rabbits.
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is good "mean corpuscular haemoglobin conc. Is written twice" REVISE THE ABBRI VIATIONS OF THE TESTED BLOOD INDICES TO BE WRITTEN IN A CORRECT WAY and WITH THE SAME ORDER OF THE FULL NAME OF THESE INDICES	"mean corpuscular haemoglobin conc" didn't appear twice, one is "mean corpuscular haemoglobin (MCH)" the other is "mean corpuscular haemoglobin concentration (MCHC)" and thy both vary in their meanings
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes	Yes
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggest ions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	No the manuscript needs more recent reference to clarify the comparisons with the results of the other researcher who work with the negative effect of dichlorovinyl dimethyl phosphate	Yes the references are recent and sufficient
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Need native language revision	Yes
Optional/General comments	<div>1. Revise the total number of experimental rabbits in section 2.1</div> <div>2. Clarify why the results chart contain two result columns for each time and what is the significance of that</div> <div>3. The HGB result is duplicated in the results section</div> <div>4. The MCV result is duplicated in the results section</div>	<div>1. The total number of experimental rabbits used in section 2.1 is revised to be 24 and not 36</div> <div>2. The two result column in the result chart is not of any significance importance, the readings were taken at different intervals</div> <div>3. The results of HGB and MCV aren't duplicated</div> <div>4. There wasn't any use of Artificial Intelligence as reviewed in the manuscript</div>

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>	No