



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_42665
Title of the Manuscript:	Relationship between Haematological Malignancies and ABO Blood Groups: A Hospital Based Study
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/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	- Lines 27 to 32: Authors talk about the different haematological malignancies, but not all of them are named (MDS, MPN, CMML...). - Paragraph of line 41-45: Authors should describe the different blood groups that exist. - Materials and methods: Authors should add a description of the patient cohort. - Materials and methods: Authors should explain how the blood group is determined. - Materials and methods (data analysis): Authors should add what kind of statistical analyzes have been done. - Table 1: civil status, educational level and occupational groups, are not relevant for the study. - Table 3: Why this distribution of age proposed? - Table 4: Are there no patients with Rh negative groups or AB group? - Table 4 and table 5: Why 0 and non-0 groups are compared? In the introduction has not been mentioned that the distinction of these groups is important. - Discussion: It is difficult to compare incidents with other studies, because in this series of patients there are only adults. Alao OO et al studied both children and adults.	The statement in the introduction has been rephrased to be "This includes but not limited to" because there many of these malignancies, but the common ones encountered in our practice are those readily mentioned. Table 1 have been corrected to reflect age and sex distribution of the subjects. The description of the study cohort have been included under study population. The authors merely extract the blood group from patient's folder since study was retrospective. Method of determination of the blood group was not stated in the patient's case note. The study was essentially among adults and the youngest subject was 17years of age, Study did not consider the Rh status of the subjects. Again from the review of the patient's notes, none had AB blood group. Reference to the O and non-O blood types have been included in the introduction
Minor REVISION comments	- Authors should clarify that it is a series of adult patients. - Authors should indicate the total number of patients studied. - Line 33-34: Authors should explain better. - Line 57: What does A2 group mean? It has not been explained previously. - Lines 60-63: Authors should explain better, it is not understood. - Line 120-121: Authors should change ":" for "versus (vs)" - Line 121: Authors should not change the order of frequencies, leads to confusion. - Line 125: Authors should change "table 4" for "table 5".	Study highlighted to show that the study population were adult patients and total number of subjects reviewed included. Line 33-34 is now better explained Explanation on A2 blood group added to introduction Line 60-63 now better explained ":" now changed to "vs" Line 125; correction effected.
Optional/General comments	In general authors should make big changes in the manuscript to give it more weight.	