



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_28234
Title of the Manuscript:	Survivin as a Prognostic Marker in Leukemic Egyptian Patients
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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1. In the "Abstract" section, all the abbreviations should be present with the full name at the first citation in the manuscript. 2. Please use a Table to describe the basic characteristics of study subjects including patients and controls. 3. Please provide the key findings only in the "Abstract". 4. In "Patients and methods" (page 3), the authors mentioned that the age matched controls for ALL and CLL, is it correct? 33-55 years old vs. 40-65 years old ? How the authors did the age-matching? 5. In "Statistical analysis" (page 4), the authors should provide detailed information regarding the tests (parametric or non-parametric methods) used in this study. 6. In the "Results", please explain what is the meaning of "5500% and 11033%"? 7. What are the C1 and C2 in Table (1)? In addition, the Table(1) should be revised to be more simplified and clear. 8. Figure (2)~(6) are present with poor resolution and should be justified. 9. Too many redundant descriptions in the "Discussion", it should be omitted. In addition, the author should provide the limitations in this study. 10. The English Editing is necessary for this	1. Done. 2. Regarding notification no.2 , 3, and 4 their sections were repeated to meet your needs. 5. Done. 6. I apologise for this mistake. The percentage change was calculated incorrectly and I corrected it in the table. 7. C1 & C2 were clarified in the table.table 1 is divided into 2 tables to be simplified and clear. 8. This is the best resolution I have. The discussion was revised and some sentences were deleted with their references.(ref. number 41 and 42)



SDI Review Form 1.6

	manuscript.	•In deed the small number represents the limitation in our study and we will recommend increasing the patients' number in the future study.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	Ethical issue: Please provide the IRB approval for this study.	This scientific paper is taken from a master Thesis approved by Ain Shams University and National Cancer Institute/ Cairo / Egypt. And this was stated in line 100 and 101. If you want the protocol signed from Ain Shams University and National Cancer Institute inform me and I will bring it signed.
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		