

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">International Blood Research &amp; Reviews</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_125550
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Mitigation of Daratumumab Interference in Pretransfusion Tests by Addition of soluble CD38 to Patients' Plasma</b>
Type of the Article	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>This manuscript offers a significant contribution to transfusion medicine by addressing the issue of Daratumumab interference in pretransfusion testing. The use of soluble CD38 (sCD38) presents a more efficient alternative to the traditional DTT method, reducing testing time from 150 to 50 minutes and improving accuracy. Its practical advantages in managing urgent transfusions and minimizing manual intervention make it highly relevant to clinical laboratories. However, further discussion on cost and broader applicability would strengthen the manuscript's impact. Overall, it effectively enhances laboratory efficiency and patient safety in transfusion settings</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p>The title "<i>Mitigation of Daratumumab Interference in Pretransfusion Tests by Addition of Soluble CD38 to Patients' Plasma</i>" is clear but could be more precise. It can be refined to better reflect the comparative analysis and the specific benefit of the soluble CD38 method.</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The abstract is generally clear but could be improved by adding a few key details for completeness. Here's what to adjust, Specify that 20 patients were studied, including those treated with Daratumumab and those untreated. Emphasize that the study compared the sCD38 method with the DTT method for mitigating Daratumumab interference. Mention the time reduction (from 150 to 50 minutes) and efficacy rates (100% for sCD38 vs. 90% for DTT) in the result. Briefly state the operational benefits and applicability in urgent cases in conclusion part.</p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p>Yes, the subsections and structure of the manuscript are generally appropriate. The paper follows a standard scientific format, including sections such as Abstract, Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, and Conclusion. This structure effectively guides the reader through the study's background, methodology, findings, and implications</p>	
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>The manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness through its rigorous methodology, including a well-defined comparative study between the sCD38 and DTT methods for mitigating Daratumumab interference in pretransfusion tests. The authors employed appropriate controls and a systematic approach to data collection, ensuring reliable results. Additionally, the statistical analyses utilized are sound, providing a clear basis for the conclusions drawn. The thorough discussion of the implications of the findings and the potential clinical applications further supports the manuscript's scientific robustness, showcasing its relevance to the field of transfusion medicine.</p>	
<p><b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b> =</p>	<p>The references cited in the manuscript appear to be relevant and provide a solid foundation for the study, covering key aspects of the study. However, the author asked to include more recent studies or reviews published within the last few years to ensure the manuscript reflects the latest advancements in the field.</p>	
<p><b>Minor</b> REVISION comments  <b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>The article sounds good but there are minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasing can be improved for better clarity and fluency</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>While the objectives of the study are mentioned, reiterating them clearly at the beginning of the results section would help guide the reader through the findings more effectively. The discussion could be expanded to address the broader implications of these findings on clinical practice, including recommendations for laboratories currently using DTT methods.</p>	

**Review Form 3**

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Vinoth R</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Thanthai Roever College of Pharmacy, India</b>