

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Pediatric Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJPR_130839
Title of the Manuscript:	Complications of Induction of Remission Chemotherapy in Childhood Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia
Type of the Article	

PART 1: 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. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</p>	<p>This manuscript provides valuable insights into the complications and outcomes associated with induction chemotherapy in children with acute lymphoblastic leukemia (ALL). Understanding these complications is crucial for optimizing treatment protocols, reducing mortality, and improving patient care in resource-limited settings. The study highlights common complications such as febrile neutropenia, respiratory issues, and hemorrhage, offering essential data for clinicians managing pediatric ALL. However, the study is limited by a small sample size and single-center data, which may reduce generalizability. Nonetheless, its findings contribute to the existing literature on pediatric ALL treatment, particularly in developing countries.</p>	
<p>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p>	<p>The title accurately reflects the content of the study, but it could be refined for clarity and specificity. A suggested alternative title is:</p> <p>"Complications and Outcomes of Induction Chemotherapy in Childhood Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia: A Single-Center Study from Bangladesh"</p> <p>This revised title provides a clearer focus on outcomes and specifies the study's context.</p>	

Review Form 3

<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>The abstract provides an adequate summary of the study; however, there are areas for improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The background should clearly mention the mortality and abandonment rates as key concerns. • The methodology lacks details on chemotherapy protocols and the criteria for defining complications. • The results should emphasize key findings, including the most common complications and their respective percentages, in a structured format. • The conclusion should discuss implications for clinical practice. <p>Suggested addition: A brief mention of limitations in the conclusion would improve transparency.</p>	
<p>Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.</p>	<p>The manuscript is generally scientifically accurate, but a few areas require clarification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study reports complications and mortality rates, but there is insufficient discussion on the severity of complications or risk factors contributing to worse outcomes. • The methodology should specify whether microbiological confirmation was performed for infections. • The statistical analysis should include confidence intervals or p-values to assess significance. <p>Recommendation: A deeper discussion comparing findings to global statistics would improve the scientific robustness.</p>	
<p>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</p>	<p>The references are mostly relevant and cover studies from various regions. However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some references are outdated (e.g., Lanzkowsky, 2005). • More recent global studies on induction chemotherapy outcomes could strengthen the discussion. • Inclusion of references on interventions to reduce treatment-related mortality would be beneficial. 	
<p>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>The manuscript has minor grammatical errors and awkward phrasing. Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Myelosuppression amd immunosuppressions are anticipated complications..." (should be "and immunosuppression"). • "Require close monitoring of these patients." (should be "These patients require close monitoring"). • "The consent form clearly described the purpose and method of the study, confidentiality of the interviews, risks and benefits..." (awkward phrasing, should be revised for clarity). <p>Recommendation: A thorough English language revision will enhance readability and scholarly quality.</p>	
<p><u>Optional/General</u> comments</p>	<p>General Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study provides useful regional data but should discuss its relevance in a global context. • More details on supportive care strategies during induction chemotherapy would be valuable. • The discussion should include potential interventions to reduce treatment abandonment rates. • Figures or graphs summarizing key results would improve readability. <p>Justification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The study provides valuable data, but improvements are needed in methodology clarity, statistical analysis, and discussion depth. • Language quality needs refinement for better scholarly communication. • Ethical and competing interest declarations need explicit mention. • References should be updated with more recent and globally relevant studies. 	

Review Form 3

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

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Kirolos Eskandar
Department, University & Country	Helwan University, Egypt