

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_95638
Title of the Manuscript:	A SINGLE CENTER 25-YEAR EXPERIENCE IN AUTOLOGOUS PERIPHERAL BLOOD STEM CELL COLLECTION: A FOCUS ON THE COLLECTION EFFICIENCY.
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

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

(<https://www.journalibrr.com/index.php/IBRR/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: 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)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>The article reported a long experience of 25 years of stem cell collection. Unfortunately, this long experience is written in a very poor English which is sometimes not understandable. The article should be largely improved by a careful editing not only on grammar point but also on meaning of sentences.</p> <p>Other points raised questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some words are inappropriately used, for example "machine" "instrumentations"... - There are no figure or table legends. - It is difficult to understand how the authors selected the parameters of the cell sorter either they used the manufacturer settings or their own parameters. - Page 4 Median body weight of patients 72 Kg (range 29-125), since the youngest patient was 18 years it is difficult to understand that a patient has a body weight of 29 Kg. - The text page 5 is too much detailed, the results are shown in the table III, only the main points have to be underlined. - Did the authors have no conflict of interest according to the use of the different type of cell separators ? 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The article should be largely improved by a careful editing not only on grammar point but also on meaning of sentences.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

PART 2:

	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)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Jean-Luc Wautier
Department, University & Country	University Denis Diderot, France