

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_106157
Title of the Manuscript:	Intramuscular extravasation of vinblastine: a case report and review of literature
Type of the Article	Case report

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.journalirjo.com/index.php/IRJO/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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, its important for scientific community simply because, the problem they are outlying is a very bad but common medication error which is often underreported. 2. There is a concept of medication error which is mentioned in the main text. In my opinion its also important information to be mentioned from the title since its known vinblastine is only for IV. Basing on this I suggest the title to be paraphrased to "Medication error and Intramuscular extravasation of vinblastine: a case report and review of literature" 3. Yes the abstract is comprehensive 4. I suggest to add a section on medication error and at least talk a little in this mishap. This will also expand the reference section 5. Yes I think its scientifically correct 6. I suggest add more reference especially on the management, and medication error, they are plenty. At least 15-20 references in title may be enough 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	Yes, just make sure the formatting of mentioning number is standard not starting with 0 just say 4 in 6 cases not 04 in 06 cases. Also, in the key words. I suggest you use accidental extravasation as one word not accidental, extravasation.	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	The topic is presented well by the authors	

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>	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Deogratias M. Katabalo
Department, University & Country	Catholic University of Health and Allied Sciences, Tanzania