



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	2014_IBRR_15692
Title of the Manuscript:	Epidemiological and biological parameters of monoclonal plasma cell dyscrasias in thirty one patients consulting a Moroccan Pasteur Institute
Type of the Article	Original article

General guideline for 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 guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	Authors studied laboratory results of patients who had monoclonal immunoglobulin spikes This study being laboratory-based has a lot of flaws; (a) the results of the patients were not corroborated with their clinical condition or state. (b) The authors could not state whether the results were obtained at presentation or at what point in the treatment course this was done. (c) The diagnosis of plasma cell dyscrasias are mainly made by finding plasmacytosis in the patients bone marrow. This is different from monoclonal gammopathies (d) The aim of the study has been lost mid-way and needs to be was not achieved. Are the authors describing features of plasma cell dyscrasias? Or patients behaviour as regards carrying out their immunological tests? (e) Authors did not tell the readers why the patients did not carry out the tests, did the patients die? Were they referred? Was it due to lack of finances etc? (f) How many of the patients had any of the CRAB features or other co-morbidities?	



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	(a) The manuscript is froth with several grammatical errors, the reviewer has tried to correct some, however someone proficient in English language needs to go through the manuscript. (b) Authors should use the mean instead of the median values (c) Prognostic indices in myeloma include a beta 2 microglobulin level of less than 3.5mg/dL, not 2.4. (d) Authors should carry out necessary statistics to determine any associations between the parameters investigated	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Anonymous
Department, University & Country	Nigeria