

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Hematology Research Journal
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AHRJ_123475
Title of the Manuscript:	Routine Diagnostic Immunophenotypic Profiling in AML Identifies Chemoresistant Patients and Predicts Treatment Outcomes
Type of the Article	Original Research 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>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
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.	The manuscript provides research results on an important topic, producing meaningful correlations between AML immunoprofiles and chemoresistance. It also groups AML patients to identify the chemoresistant group early. Additionally, it offers insights for future research.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, however, avoid abbreviations ...acute myeloid leukemia instead of AML.	
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.	Yes, the abstract is almost representative; however, characteristics of patients and the study design should be included. In addition, too many abbreviations that are difficult to grasp.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	<p>Introduction Appropriate</p> <p>Material and method section an sub sections</p> <p>As an original article, the subsections can be rearranged as follows: Study area and design, patient characteristics and variables, sample size and sampling technique, how the data collected and statistical analysis. In addition, subsection 2.2(Immunophenotyping of AML) and 2.3 (Molecular and Cytogenetic analysis) can be placed at the end, just before statistical analysis.</p> <p>Result section and sub sections</p> <p>Appropriate</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Appropriate</p> <p>Authors are advised to add Section on Limitations of the study</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.	The manuscript is essential in that it provides details of the patient imunophenotypic profile and their relation in terms of chemoresistance. The study design employed, although retrospective, was appropriate for producing correlation, which can be further tested by controlling confounders and performing regression analysis. Results are presented clearly and logically, supported by tables and figures, and a justifiable conclusion can be drawn. Furthermore, meaningful conclusion can be drawn from the observed correlation. Finally, it can provide meaningful contribution to the field. Authors are advised to clearly describe the methodology section, so that it can be reproducible by other researchers.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Sufficient references, however, old references, as old as 10 years, were used frequently.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments		
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Suitable. Minor spelling and punctuation mark corrections needed.	
Optional/General comments	None	

PART 2:

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Dinberu Oyamo
Department, University & Country	Dilla University Hospital, Ethiopia