

[Review Form2](#)

Book Name:	Medicine and Medical Research: New Perspectives
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BPR_2444
Title of the Manuscript:	Diagnosis and Monitoring of Plasma Cell Neoplasms: Role of Serum Protein Electrophoresis
Type of the Article	Book chapter

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">COMMENTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the results mentioned in the abstract, if 153 cases had monoclonal gammopathy, then how were the 280 cases were diagnosed as multiple myeloma. (Line: Among the 455 cases, 153 (33.63%) had monoclonal gammopathy, with IgG κ being the most prevalent type of monoclonal protein found (47.50%). Total 280 (61.53%) cases were of multiple myeloma) What percentage of patients among those with M band were new and what percentage were among the category of monitoring of plasma cell neoplasm? Please provide clarity of the characterisation of the M band among the new cases and those already diagnosed and were under monitoring. In the study quantitation of M band was not described, but it one of the aims of the study. (Line: This study also aims to quantitate the M band in patients of plasma cell neoplasm for categorization as well as therapeutic monitoring of plasma cell neoplasm) Nothing about the sensitivity of the tests was done in the study, but the sensitivity was mentioned as 100%. (Line: This study found that serum protein electrophoresis and immunofixation were highly sensitive (100%) in patients diagnosed with plasma cell myeloma) 	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>		
<p>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</p>		
<p>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p>		
<p>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically</p>		

[Review Form2](#)

robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.		
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.		
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?		
Optional/General comments		

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Arshiya Anjum
Department, University & Country	India