

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_75236
Title of the Manuscript:	Investigation of FMS-Like Tyrosine Kinase 3 Mutation Frequency in Myelodysplastic Syndrome
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://peerreviewcentral.com/page/manuscript-withdrawal-policy>)

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	<p>This manuscript proffers strategic approaches of risk stratification of clonal haematological malignancies such as MDS, AML, ALL using genetic-based technique (i.e., FLT-3 mutation frequency) for mutations identification.</p> <p>This innovation has the capacity to predict the prognosis, relapse/refractory rates, and overall survival outcomes of the sufferers.</p> <p>ABSTRACT: The title and running head are informative and relevant. The study aim and methodology are clear with no ambiguity. The findings of the study are clear. The conclusion is clear and could be useful in policy-making. The study shows appropriate keywords with minimal or no grammar/spelling errors.</p> <p>INTRODUCTION: The introduction is clear on what is already known about this topic. It clearly outlined the research question. The research question is justified given what is already known about the topic.</p> <p>MATERIALS & METHODS: The study design is clearly stated. The subject selection criteria are clear. Most variables were defined and measured appropriately. The study methods are valid and reliable. To a large extent, there is enough detail to replicate the study (i.e., the study is reproducible). Data management and statistical approach to analysis are clear.</p> <p>However, it is worthy of note that some terminologies used in the study were not decoded for easy understanding. For example, what are the definitions of FAM and HEX? Also, for better understanding, describe this section (materials and methods) under sub-headings such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1. Study design 2.2. Selection criteria 2.3. Sample size 2.4. Survey procedure 2.5. Specimen collection & laboratory method 2.5. Statistical analysis <p>The statistical analysis that is labelled 3 in the manuscript should be under materials and methods.</p> <p>The issues about ethical consideration should be discussed at the ethical approval section after conclusion.</p> <p>Kindly address comments [ON1-ON3] in the materials and method section.</p> <p>RESULTS: The data are presented in appropriate way. The tables and figures are relevant and clearly presented. The titles, columns and rows are labelled correctly. The units, numbers and decimals are appropriately presented. Kindly address comments [ON4-ON6] in the results section of the manuscript.</p> <p>DISCUSSION: The results were discussed from multiple angles and placed into context. The conclusions are supported by multiple references enumerated at the discussion. The limitations offer opportunities for a more informed future research in the subject of discussion. The paper is well-integrated with current researches.</p> <p>ETHICAL APPROVAL: Address the comment [ON1] in materials & methods and comment [ON7].</p>	

Review Form 1.6

	COMPETING INTEREST: Not declared. REFERENCES: Correct citation and referencing style were strictly adhered to.	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	Rearrange the numbering of the structure of the manuscript bearing in mind that the "statistical analysis " falls under materials & methods section.	

As per the guideline of editorial office we have followed VANCOUVER reference style for our paper.

Kindly see the following link:

<http://sciencedomain.org/archives/20>

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<i>Ogbonna Collins Nwabuko</i>
Department, University & Country	<i>University of Calabar, Nigeria</i>