Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	**Ms_JCTI_66813**
Title of the Manuscript:	**A review of haematological parameters and bone marrow aspirations at presentation in children diagnosed with acute leukaemias – a single centre experience in southern Nigeria**
Type of the Article	**Original Research 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/journal/10/editorial-policy)

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	The article provides a good approach of leukaemia in a regional area of Nigeria. The aim of the manuscript is clear. However, there are some important modifications required prior the publication: **Abstract:** Conclusions should be a resume of the paper. Authors begin this section with some results, being not necessary. It would be interesting to remark the main points of the article. **Introduction:** All the abbreviators should be defined (LMIC). It must be structured appropriate (i.e., first paragraph explains the different types of leukaemias, following clinical characteristics and the third paragraph is another time a classification). **Methods**: Authors must define the data required to be included in the work. It does not have sense define exclusion criteria as "Cases with insufficient data were excluded from the study" without this information. In addition, diagnosis criteria should include a reference. **Results**: Figure 1 should be a table to be easier to know the exact data of the symptoms. If the abbreviators were defined previously, it is not necessary to repeat it (it excludes figures and tables, where footnote must include all the definitions to be auto explicative). Figures 3 and 4 are not necessary. **Discussion**: First paragraph should summarize the main points of the study without comparisons with previous data. In addition, limitations of the study should be included in first/second paragraph. In addition, it should be interesting to realize a more expense review of the literature.	Comments have been noted and addressed.
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	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)*
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	*(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)*	