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|  | Reviewer’s comment**Artificial Intelligence (AI) generated or assisted review comments are strictly prohibited during peer review.** | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **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 manuscript offers valuable insight into the practical application of local preoperative transfusion guidelines for sickle cell disease (SCD) patients in a real-world setting. It adds to the existing literature by providing outcome-based evidence from a large tertiary care center. The study evaluates both medical and surgical variables, correlating them with transfusion modalities, and highlights the beneficial effects of hydroxyurea and anticoagulant therapy. This work is particularly important for regions with a high prevalence of SCD and limited transfusion infrastructure.** |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | **Yes, the title is appropriate and reflects the core content of the study.** |  |
| 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 first two sentences are repetitive—avoid repeating "The medical records of 75 SCD patients...".****Mention of statistical significance (p-values) in the abstract is good, but the specific results for different transfusion types could be more concisely stated.****Recommendation: Shorten the methods section slightly to give more space for key findings and implications.** |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.**  | **Yes. The study design, data analysis, and interpretation are methodologically sound. The sample size, though modest, is reasonable for a single-center retrospective review. The stratification by transfusion type and incorporation of hydroxyurea and heparin effects add depth. The manuscript references established literature and compares findings effectively.** |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | **The references are comprehensive and appropriate. Most key studies in the domain of SCD and transfusion have been cited. However, the inclusion of a few more recent reviews from the past 5 years (post-2020) could further strengthen the literature review.** |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | Overall, the English is readable and academic. The manuscript would benefit from a thorough professional language edit to enhance clarity and flow. |  |
| Optional/General comments | Consider including a flowchart of patient inclusion and exclusion.Figures (such as hospital protocols) are embedded but not clearly described in the results—brief descriptions should be added in-text.The manuscript is scientifically robust and contextually important. With some improvements in language, formatting, and abstract refinement, it would be a strong contribution to the book chapter. |  |
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