



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_40087
Title of the Manuscript:	Prevalence of hepatitis C virus infection in non Hodgkin's lymphoma and its effect on the treatment outcome.
Type of the Article	Original research paper

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>)

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	Preliminary, I think that paper has merit to be published in the JCTI journal. However, the authors should perform some adjusts in the original propose. First of all, they have to clarify in the abstract already that the study in a retrospective analysis and separate two groups, aggressive DLBCL and indolent ones, follicular and marginal zone lymphomas. It is not clear why a few number of patients used Rituximab in the treatment. I suggest an inclusion of multivariate analysis in order to confirm the clinical and laboratorial risk factors. Is it possible to analysis DLBCL and low grade individually? It is possible to reduce the number of Tables? Six is too much.	Many thanks for your excellent revision and comments. We studied prevalence of HCV in patients presented with non-Hodgkin's lymphoma regardless of its type. In our retrospective study, we did no interference with treatment modality. Very small number of patients were excluded (2 cases) as they had combined HCV and HBV infection . Tables now are five tables.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	In my opinion the paper could be accepted but have to do some modifications and clarify and include some complementary data.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		