

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Research Journal of Oncology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IRJO_83989
Title of the Manuscript:	Multiparameter Flow Cytometry Immunophenotyping for the Identification of Smoldering Multiple Myeloma: A Case Report
Type of the Article	Case report

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:

(<https://www.journalirjo.com/index.php/IRJO/editorial-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>"SMM, initially described in 1980, intermediate stage between monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS) and multiple myeloma (MM), with higher disease burden."(introduction part): Please add a verb to this phrase.</p> <p>Numbers between 0 and 10 are better spelled out. (instead of 5, write five)</p> <p>"So, it is important to accurately diagnose and risk-stratify patients with SMM, by incorporating modern imaging and laboratory techniques routinely" Please write what are the lab techniques.</p> <p> "This case report presents the potential utility of multiparameter flow cytometry (MFC) immunophenotyping in diagnosing SMM correlating with clinical features, serum calcium, peripheral blood smear findings, bone marrow study, urine analysis for Bence Jones Protein and bone lesions, in addition, accurately distinguishing and quantitating BMPCs that have malignant potential from normal PCs.</p> <p>Extremely long phrase and wordy. Kindly try to reformulate.</p> <p>Add please how was MFC described in the literature. Are there a controversy about it?</p> <p>Kindly express more the GAP in knowledge about it.</p> <p>The introduction is very short and should include more about MFC. State how this case is unique and what additional value it adds to the literature.</p> <p>You wrote in the intro that SMM is asymptomatic then you described a case of SMM presenting with fever and other symptoms. Please correct this.</p> <p>There were many grammatical errors in the case presentation and the rest of the article. Kindly check it.</p> <p>Add the duration for symptoms. Since when the patient had fever and what how much was his temperature? Where there any constitutional symptoms? Was the patient able to walk? Was he conscious cooperative on admission? Kindly add more information on his state of presentation.</p> <p>Kindly highlight more the additional value that adds this article to the literature in the conclusion part along with a key message to take from this article.</p>	<p>The manuscript has been corrected according to Reviewer's comments which has been highlighted in yellow.</p>
Minor REVISION comments	<p>It might be usefull to add the race/ethnicity of the patient (Caucasian, asian...)</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>The patient was Asian and has been added in manuscript.</p>
Optional/General comments	<p>_____</p>	

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