

Review of: "The In Vivo Erythrocyte Sedimentation Rate (ESR) Test: Pandemic Reemergence of Robin Fåhræus's "Fibrin Coagula""

Zelalem Desalegn^{1,2}

¹ Microbiology, Immunology and Parasitology, Addis Ababa University, Ethiopia

² Martin-Luther Universität Halle-Wittenberg, Germany

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Title: The title is not clear, and it needs further refinement to understand what has been intended for review. Again, try to spell out words clearly, including reemergence: re-emergence; In Vivo: In-vivo.

Abstract: At the end of the abstract, you end up with incomplete descriptions. Hence, you need to provide a comprehensive meaningful statement about the significance of this work, highlighting the gained knowledge to utilize it in clinical practice for better decision-making.

Introduction: The way you start this section is not good. Try to add existing knowledge in a way that describes what has been known so far. Add also the clinical significance of ESR across various disease conditions, and I advise you to highlight some of the disadvantages of this test. Again, it would be nice if you compared this test with other tests to see its significance.

Figures: The quality of the figures needs further work. You mentioned that the figure was reproduced, and you put references. Have you got permission to use the figure beyond referencing?

Figure 3: Try to adjust the orientation of the figure so that the patient hand rests horizontally. Somewhat an odd way of figure presentation.

General comment: I did not see a conclusion from your review.

General comment: The review lacks detail. Therefore, it needs further rigorous review of articles.

General impression: It needs further work before deciding about its fate.