

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Hematology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AHRJ_98983
Title of the Manuscript:	Clinical profile of multiple myeloma in National Oncology Center, Aden, Yemen
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.journalahrj.com/index.php/AHRJ/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)
Compulsory REVISION comments 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. <u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u>	This is a study investigated the multiple myeloma patients' profile from Aden. Title is suitable. Abstract section is too long. Conclusion part of this section includes the findings of this study and should be deleted. Because, conclusion section should include the comments and suggestions of the authors to contribute to the literature, not the findings of the study. So, authors may simplify this part and shorten the abstract section. Third and fourth paragraphs of the introduction section include some data that should be given in the discussion section. Reference numbers should be written in a standardized format in the whole text. There are some typos and should be revised. There is a font error in materials and methods section. There are too many tables and repeated data either in the text and in the tables, and this data should be simplified and shortened. I think, the figure that contains the microscopic slides should be named as Figure 1. Figure 3 should include the definition of number 1 and 2 as the male and female genders. In the whole text, I think writing gender instead of sex should be better. Conclusion section of this section includes the findings of this study and this findings should be deleted. Because, conclusion section should include the comments and suggestions of the authors to contribute to the literature, not the findings of the study. References are sufficient.	
Minor REVISION comments 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	There are some spelling errors and the text needs English editing.	
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ilker Ilhanli
Department, University & Country	Ondokuz Mayıs University, Türkiye