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ABSTRACT

Introduction
The differential diagnosis of plasmablastic lymphoma (PBL) form plasmablastic myeloma (PBM) is sometime very difficult. In such cases, the diagnosis of plasmablastic neoplasm (PBN) is acceptable. But clinicians face the question whether chemotherapies for PBL, PBM or others are effective for PBN and the question increases the diagnosis dilemma. Although evidence on the differential diagnosis and treatment of those three entities is compiling, there is no scoping review of different diagnosis and treatment for PBL, PBM, and PBN to answer those questions. The aim of this study is to develop an a priori protocol to undertake a scoping review of the available evidence on the reproducibility of differential diagnosis and the treatment of PBL, PBM, and PBN.

Methods and analysis
For the conducting the scoping review protocol, we will use an scoping review methodology established in the Joanna Briggs Institute manual. This methodology has a five-stage approach: (1) identify the research question; (2) identify relevant studies; (3) select studies; (4) chart the data and (5) collating, summarize and report the results. We also will use the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Extension for Scoping Reviews to assess the results.

Ethics and dissemination
Since this is a review of the literature, ethics approval is not indicated. We will disseminate the findings from this study in publications in peer-reviewed journals.
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