

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Hematology Research Journal</a>
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**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	<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)
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.	AML cases have been on the rise from 9,400 in 1998 to 19,580 in 2018, an increase of 108%. According to the statistics given by the American Cancer Society the five year survival rate of patients under the age of 60 years diagnosed with AML is 30-40%. An early idea of the phenotype of the AML could lead to better insights for the therapeutic treatment planning.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title is suitable as it follows PICOT format	
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 comprehensive. No addition or deletion of points is necessary.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	Yes	
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.	Article is scientifically robust and technically sound. The statistics are technically correct and written in detail.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	Yes, references are sufficient.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments  Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	In materials and methods section of the manuscript, the word cytochemistry is misspelled. There is no mention of informed consent taken for the patients involved in the study. Any patients that might have been lost to follow-up has not been mentioned, doing so would increase the quality of the article data. Limitations of the study can be mentioned so as to give a well-rounded impact of the article.	

### 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>Mrunmayee Soman</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Bharati Vidyapeeth Dental College and Hospital, India</b>