

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>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The reviewed article provides an insightful examination of haematological malignancies, focusing on the diagnostic challenges in South South Nigeria. The introduction effectively highlights the global burden of these malignancies and emphasizes their impact on morbidity and mortality, particularly in resource-limited settings such as Nigeria. The incidence, diagnosis, and treatment of haematological cancers, including leukaemia, lymphomas, and multiple myeloma, are discussed, providing a global context and honing in on the significant challenges faced by Nigeria's healthcare system. This detailed and timely exploration serves as a call to action for healthcare improvements, particularly in diagnostics, to alleviate the burden of these diseases in Nigeria.</p> <p>Strengths of the Article</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive Overview: The introduction presents a thorough overview of the global burden of haematological malignancies, highlighting the increasing incidence and declining age-standardized death rates globally. The global-to-local perspective helps the reader understand how Nigeria fits into the wider framework of cancer epidemiology, with a clear focus on leukaemia, which is the most prevalent haematological malignancy worldwide. Clear Focus on Nigeria's Public Health Context: The focus on Nigeria, particularly the statistical information related to the burden of leukaemia and other haematological malignancies, offers valuable insight into the local public health crisis. The statistics are well-presented, underscoring the severity of the issue with facts such as leukaemia's 6th rank in mortality rates in Nigeria. In-depth Examination of Challenges: The article does well to elaborate on the diagnostic challenges in Nigeria, such as financial constraints, lack of diagnostic infrastructure, and delays due to inadequate training of healthcare professionals. It highlights various factors like poverty, cultural beliefs, and reliance on traditional healers, which complicate the timely diagnosis and effective treatment of patients. This section is crucial in contextualizing the problem within Nigeria's unique healthcare environment. Use of Case Studies and Literature Review: The article's use of case studies and references to local research makes the findings relatable and specific. Studies from Lagos, Calabar, and other Nigerian regions provide concrete evidence supporting the broader points made in the discussion. The comparison between developed and developing countries helps illustrate the stark disparity in healthcare outcomes, driving home the need for systemic improvements. Methodological Rigor: The methodology section describes an exhaustive process of data collection via surveys, interviews, and reviews of existing literature. The approach of triangulating multiple data sources to understand the diagnostic challenges gives credibility to the study's findings. <p>Opportunities for Improvement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient Exploration of Global Solutions: Although the article highlights the problems in Nigeria, it does not delve into potential solutions from other low-resource countries or successful models in similar settings. A comparative analysis of how other developing 	

Review Form 3

	<p>countries have addressed similar challenges could provide valuable insights into what might work in Nigeria.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Minimal Discussion of Technological Advances: The paper highlights a lack of advanced diagnostic methods such as immunophenotyping and polymerase chain reaction but does not explore recent technological advances that could be leveraged to improve diagnosis in low-resource settings. For example, it could explore cost-effective mobile diagnostic tools, telemedicine, or international partnerships aimed at improving local diagnostic capacity. Unclear Presentation of Data: While the article provides a lot of numerical data (e.g., incidence rates, mortality rates), the presentation is dense, and it could benefit from visual aids such as charts or graphs. Visual representation of data would make it easier for readers to grasp the severity of the issue quickly and enhance the readability of the article. More Detailed Policy Recommendations: The conclusion rightly calls for improvements in healthcare infrastructure, professional training, and public awareness, but these recommendations are broad. A more detailed outline of policy changes, resource allocation strategies, or stakeholder engagement plans would strengthen the article's impact. It should propose more specific actionable steps, such as advocating for public-private partnerships, government funding initiatives, or international support for diagnostic equipment and training. Ethical Considerations: The article lacks a discussion on ethical considerations, especially when discussing the diagnostic delays and financial constraints that lead to patients resorting to unorthodox treatments. An exploration of the ethical implications of healthcare inequality in Nigeria, and how to address this ethically, could add depth to the discussion. <p>Conclusion</p> <p>In conclusion, the article is a robust examination of the diagnostic challenges surrounding haematological malignancies in Nigeria, providing a valuable snapshot of the public health crisis. The clear presentation of the problem and in-depth analysis of diagnostic barriers make it a compelling piece of research. However, it falls short in proposing specific, innovative solutions and could benefit from a stronger focus on actionable policy recommendations. There is room for improvement in the exploration of technological advancements and ethical considerations. Despite these limitations, the article makes a significant contribution to the understanding of haematological malignancies in Nigeria, offering a well-rounded discussion of both the clinical and socioeconomic factors at play.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>		
<p>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.</p>		
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>		
<p>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.</p>		
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>		
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</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:	Jonas Michel Wolf
Department, University & Country	Hospital Moinhos de Vento, Brazil