

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_125111
Title of the Manuscript:	Diagnostic Challenges in Hematological Malignancies in Nigeria and Their Impact on Treatment Outcome: The experience of a tertiary health institution in South South Nigeria
Type of the Article	Review Article

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

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is important to tackle the issues possessing these diagnostic challenges as it will promote better management of patients with hematological malignancy. This should be done carefully in order to improve factors that led to poor performance in each step such as introduction of adequate diagnostic means, more education of health workers and general populations. There will be more reasonable time for treatment and treatment management eliminating delays associated with diagnosing the right disease. The current study is a partial replication of the paper published in Journal of Biomedical Research and Clinical Practice: "Haematological Malignancies in Nigeria: Challenges in Diagnosis and Management – A Systematic Review" It is difficult to find novelty in the present work	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	As the present manuscript is a review article the "The experience of a tertiary health institution in South South Nigeria", may be confusing for the readers. It would like to suggest to modify the manuscript title to catch more readers: "Diagnostic Challenges in Hematological Malignancies in Nigeria and Their Impact on Treatment Outcome."	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is comprehensive. I would like to suggest language editing in the abstract section	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I would like to add a section on need of the current review. It is better to avoid subheading "Description of Study Area", I feel it is not relevant as the present manuscript is a review. Other subsections are found to be appropriate	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	As the present manuscript is a review, it would more clear if you could justify the need of interview to gather first-hand information, that is mentioned in your methodology. I would like to suggest that it would be more acceptable if you could add the selection criteria of the literature along with the time frame and quality assurance methods. In the abstract, author stated that the reviewed literature was extracted from Google Scholar/PubMed/African Journal Online. But author only mentioned about Google Scholar in the methodology part. It would be suggested to add a flow chart on literature selection process. Results of the review shall be presented with review evidence with supporting tables or documents; otherwise, I am afraid that the authenticity of the review might be questioned by the readers. It would be suggested to add limitations of the current review Suggesting a major revision in the methodology section	

Review Form 3

Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes	
<u>Minor REVISION</u> comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Language editing is recommended	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The manuscript can only be accepted if it has undergone major revisions.	

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Abhilash Venunathan
Department, University & Country	JDT Islam College of Nursing, Kerala University of Health Sciences, India