

**Review Form 3**

Journal Name:	<b>Asian Journal of Case Reports in Medicine and Health</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_AJCRMH_123362</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>A case report on multiple myeloma: A masquerading neoplasm in a 36-year-old female.</b>
Type of the Article	<b>Case report</b>

**Review Form 3**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> <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><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 is important for the scientific community because it highlights a rare and atypical presentation of multiple myeloma (MM) in a young female patient, which deviates from the traditional demographic and clinical features commonly associated with this condition. By illustrating how MM can mimic other diseases and present without characteristic symptoms such as hypercalcemia or lytic bone lesions, this case report emphasizes the need for clinicians to consider MM in differential diagnoses, even in less suspicious demographics. I appreciate this manuscript because it underscores the significance of maintaining a high index of suspicion and the importance of interdisciplinary collaboration for early diagnosis and treatment. Such reports contribute to broadening our understanding of MM's diverse clinical spectrum, ultimately improving patient outcomes through timely intervention.</p>	
<p><b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b></p>	<p><b>The title of the article is suitable</b></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><b>The summary of the article has been prepared in accordance with the text.</b></p>	
<p><b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b></p>	<p><b>It has been prepared in accordance with the subsections and structure of the article.</b></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>This manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound because it is based on a thorough and detailed case study, supported by extensive diagnostic testing that adheres to established guidelines, such as the International Myeloma Working Group Diagnostic Criteria. The inclusion of multiple diagnostic modalities—ranging from blood tests and imaging to immunohistochemistry and bone marrow biopsy—demonstrates a comprehensive approach to confirming the diagnosis of multiple myeloma. Additionally, the manuscript provides a well-rounded discussion that compares this case with existing literature, highlighting both typical and atypical presentations of multiple myeloma. This careful analysis and evidence-based approach ensure the scientific accuracy and reliability of the findings.</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><b>References are up to date</b></p>	

**Review Form 3**

<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p><b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b></p>	<p>Yes, the language and English quality of the article are suitable for scholarly communications. The manuscript is written in clear, professional, and concise language, which effectively conveys the clinical findings, diagnostic process, and significance of the case. Technical terms and medical jargon are used appropriately, ensuring that the content is accurate and accessible to healthcare professionals and researchers familiar with the field.</p>	
<p><b>Optional/General</b> comments</p>	<p>This case report offers valuable insights into the atypical presentation of multiple myeloma (MM) in a younger patient demographic, which is traditionally not associated with the disease. The manuscript effectively highlights the challenges in diagnosing MM when it lacks classic symptoms such as hypercalcemia and lytic bone lesions, which could mislead clinicians into considering other differential diagnoses. The thorough diagnostic approach outlined in the report, including the use of serum protein electrophoresis and bone marrow biopsy, underscores the importance of comprehensive testing in cases of unexplained symptoms. This manuscript is a useful contribution to medical literature, encouraging clinicians to remain vigilant for MM even in non-traditional patient profiles. It also emphasizes the significance of interdisciplinary collaboration for early and accurate diagnosis, which can lead to better patient outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Figure 1 is not referenced within the text. It needs to be corrected.</li> <li>• Reference 1 is not formatted correctly.</li> <li>• It is necessary to state that the informed consent form was obtained and that there are no conflicts of interest.</li> <li>• "Multiple myeloma" was abbreviated, but the abbreviation was not used subsequently.</li> <li>• The abstract exceeds 250 words. It should be shortened to 250 words.</li> <li>• Authors' Contributions should be included.</li> <li>• Keywords are missing.</li> </ul> <p>The article does not comply with the journal's guidelines. In addition to the deficiencies I have noted, it should be thoroughly reviewed and corrected.</p>	

**PART 2:**

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

**Reviewer Details:**

<p>Name:</p>	<p><b>Derya Altunkanat</b></p>
<p>Department, University &amp; Country</p>	<p><b>University of Health Sciences, Turkey</b></p>