



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_46993
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of a lymphoid variant of acute leukemia after five-fold treatments of ovulation induction
Type of the 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		
Minor REVISION comments	<p>Abstract Line 11 - body mass index should be 22kg/m² Line 12 – include 'she' after ovulation Line 14 – was appeared does not look good, correct it</p> <p>Introduction Line 21 – reference [3-5] were cited before reference [1] in line 26 Line 21 – 22 - the sentences appeared too independent, please link them to make it flow Line 31 – include 'and' after forecasting</p> <p>Methods and materials Line 38 – instrumental studies is a remote terminology</p> <p>Results Line 43 – 'increasing t⁰C of the body to 37,8⁰C' should be fever since author is discussing symptoms Line 45 – 'single liquid stool' is preferably loose stool on one occasion Line 46 – duration of symptoms like one week ago (including others below) should be prior to presentation, e.g. 1 week prior to presentation Line 47 – begin to disturb Line 48 – the antibiotic should be deleted Line 49 – did not pass should be replaced with 'did not subside' Line 49 - , t⁰C of the body grew, should be replaced with either 'temperature persisted or increased' Line 50 - please change A woman was to 'the woman was' Line 51 - but the pregnancy did not occur, remove 'the' Line 53 – how long did she take Dostinex? Line 57 – objectivity should preferably be - findings on clinical examination Line 58-62 – the following sentences should be reviewed: state of moderate severity physiological color RR- of 18 beats/min. it should be 'cycles per minute' Heart sounds are clear. It should be one and two only and no murmur Listened to peristalsis is active A symptom of a beating on the lower back Line 70-73 – treatment should not be included in the diagnosis Line 74 – I suggest 'follow-up management' instead of inspection Line 74-79 – the sentences are disjointed, please link them to make it flow</p>	Thank you very much for your corrective comments. Author have measures taken to fix the problems.
Optional/General comments	<p>Inspection from 74 – 224 should be summarised, and only the most important points should be presented. The day to day management presented is too ambiguous</p> <p>Discussion</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Line 229 - Health risks associated with assisted reproductive technology</p> <p>This illustration should be linked to the subject in question, which is ovarian hyperstimulation syndrome leading to chronic lymphocytic leukemia</p> <p>Line 250 – 252 - All symptoms of hyperstimulation syndrome occurred in our patient except for enlarged ovaries. We believe it was due to the hospitalization in critical condition 2 months after the onset of the disease. Does it mean that the hospitalization was responsible for the hyper stimulation symptoms?</p> <p>Line 252 - Moreover, the changes in blood, characteristic of leukemia, the patient was not – this statement is not clear</p> <p>References There are no references in the entire discussion Reference Only [1] and [3-5] were sighted in the introduction 2, 6 and 7 were not sighted in the entire study References were too old – the most current was in 2013 (over 5 years) Too few references – only 7 cited</p>	
--	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> <p>Ethical committee approval was not mentioned</p>	