



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

Journal Name:	<u>International Blood Research & Reviews</u>
Manuscript Number:	2013_IBRR_5340
Title of the Manuscript:	JAK-2V617F Mutation In Acute Leukemia (South Egypt Experience)
Type of the Article	Research Paper

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 7 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

	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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	It's important from a scientific point of view that the classification of acute leukaemia would be based on the more recent WHO 2008 classification. Moreover you add some data on the Flt3 mutational status that is part of the WHO classification and so it appears at least incorrect to not classify the disease according to a more modern classification. Moreover, a correct evaluation needs also data on the other mutation like NPM1, and also cytogenetic data on t (8;21), inv 16 and all the other important chromosomal abnormalities we currently use to classify AML. This could clarify why you did not found any Jak2 mutation (see Markova Leuk Lymphoma. 2009 Sep;50(9):1448-60. doi: 10.1080/10428190903085951). About ALL subgroup there is not reported the MLL status.	We couldn't classify our patients with WHO classification as we don't have facilities or budget to bring all chromosomal Probes, as you know Egypt in the past 2 years faced major political issues which affect our economy consequently this reflected on our institute budget so we used FAB classification.
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	It's should be clarify if the patients has "de novo" or secondary AML and the clarification should be added in the Methods section. There are different capital letter were there should not be basing on the full stop position. In the section references there are some errors so it should be extensively reviewed.	All our patients were denovo and this added in the Methods section
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	Moreover in 2010 Swaminathan has published on EJH a letter to the editor on this topic (doi:10.1111/j.1600-0609.2009.01359) underling the correlation between the t (8;21) and the presence of Jak V617F. It's would be better to reduce the introduction which appears to long. Moreover it's imperative to consider that the article	I reduced the introduction



SDI Review Form 1.6

	could also be written in "letters to the editor" format, if accepted by the journal	
--	---	--