Reviewer 1: This review is a compact summary of the group experiments headed by Prof. Taneva from the field of multiple myeloma performed by DSC with a wide outlook on the international publications.

The quality of the instrument is at top level, and during the data evaluation they use the international standards of statistical methods. The achieved results are compared with the thermal parameters of separated plasma compounds. The conclusions have strong clinical relevances.

The construction of paper fit to the standards of Cancers, the text is well written and very easy to read and follow it.

I have only some remarks in connection with the typing of calorimetric parameters:

In the figures the subscripts and superscripts are written properly but in the text, figure as well as table captions are wrong [e.g.: Tm, and instead of Cp is written cP (it is heat capacity and not specific heat!) and so on]. These should be corrected.

We thank the reviewer for the positive evaluation of our manuscript.

Unfortunately, we didn't notice that the subscripts and superscripts were not correct, they were probably changed when the text was placed in the template.
We made the necessary corrections in the revised MS.

During the evaluation they calculate excess heat capacity (my opinion is, that this parameter is less informative for the medical doctors than the calorimetric enthalpy). They express it in cal/gK. The recommendation of ICTAC (this international organisation made an official recommendation for the units of thermal analytical parameters) in connection with this unit is kJ/kgK!

We actually used both terms „excess heat capacity" and „amplitude" of the transitions, the latter one is easily understandable. In order to use calorimetric enthalpy instead of heat capacity all of the thermograms (more than 600) have to be deconvoluted. Since the enthalpy of certian transition should be proportional to the heat capacity, we believe that this additional estimation will not provide much new information that would affect the take-home message of the manuscript.

If the reviewer agrees, we prefer not to change the units in this paper because cal/gK was used in most of our previous publications, and it is widely used in the literature relevant to this review, although as the reviewer stated according to the ICTAC the recommended unit is kJ/kgK. Converting the units would make the comparison of data published in different articles much more difficult.