

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_97120
Title of the Manuscript:	Response to Tyrosine Kinase Inhibitors (TKI) in patients with BCR-ABL1 Positive Chronic Myeloid Leukemia; 13.5 years' experience at Patan Hospital, Nepal
Type of the 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.journalibr.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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>		
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>The study seems interesting. The authors should consider the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Please reduce the wording in the abstract. Expunge unnecessary statements to 250 words in total. 2. Check for grammatical and typographical errors and correct them. 3. Keywords should be limited to 5 words. 4. Which statistical package did you use to analyse your data in the study? 5. Provide an ethical clearance number for the study. 6. Overall, the retrospective study seems good. Authors should reduce unnecessary statements, check for plagiarism, and reduce the similarity index to the nearest minimum. 	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

Review Form 1.7

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>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Victor Baba Oti
Department, University & Country	Griffith University, Australia