

SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Journal of Cancer and Tumor International
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JCTI_47341
Title of the Manuscript:	Autoimmune Haemolytic Anaemia in Patients with Cancer Diagnoses
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that <u>NO</u> manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '<u>lack of Novelty'</u>, 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 agree highlight that part in the mat his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments		
	In this paper the authors try to determine the prevalence of AIHA in cancer patients in Port Harcourt, if AIHA plays a role in the pathogenesis of anaemia seen in patients with cancer diagnoses and to assess which cancers are associated with AIHA. I think that these questions have been answered from the previous studies and the authors confirm these in their study. From this point of you I do not find the paper interesting. Furthermore I have two comments. Which is the status of cancer patients regarding the HCV, HIV and hepatitis B? especially in DAT positive patients. I think that the authors ought to exclude from the study each patient positive for HCV or HIV or hepatitis B.	
	statistically significant. The proportion of patients with reticulocytosis were more in the group receiving chemotherapy (19.2% compared to 8.7% in those without chemotherapy), whereas the patients without chemotherapy had more cases of reticulocytopenia (16.4%) compared to 11.5% in the chemotherapy group. How do you explain that? Usually chemotherapy has an inhibition effect on the bone marrow and reticulocytes increases when marrow is recovered. Did the authors examine the patients at that point?	
Minor REVISION comments	Write together inclusion or exclusion criteria. Please check line 59-60	
Optional/General comments		

eed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and anuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write



PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed that part in the manuscript. It is feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Vlachaki Efthymia
Department, University & Country	Aristotle University, Greece

with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight s mandatory that authors should write his/her