



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<u>International Journal of Medical and Pharmaceutical Case Reports</u>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJMPCR_29258
Title of the Manuscript:	Interference with creatinine assay by IgM-λ monoclonal protein in lithium heparin blood collection tube from a malignant lymphoma patient
Type of the Article	Case study

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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Analytical interference is known to be the leading cause of incorrect laboratory results. And this case report clearly describes such an example of this phenomenon. This case should be beneficial for especially clinicians working in Hematology, Oncology, Emergency, and Biochemistry Departments.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Some minor writing mistakes are given as follows: Line 19: phosphate ²). → phosphate [2]. Line 27: university hospital → University Hospital In Table 1: LD? Should it be LDH? Table 1: The abbreviations should be given. Line 54: measured as 0.74 mg/dL and 0.81 mg/dL, respectively. → measured as 0.81 mg/dL and 0.74 mg/dL, respectively. Line 69: university hospital, → University Hospital,	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Good work.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Burak Uz
Department, University & Country	Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Adult Hematology, Faculty of Medicine, Gazi University, Turkey