

**Degree of fibrosis and its association with angiogenesis in the myelofibrotic bone marrow.**Afroz S et al. ([sadiatoma2813@gmail.com](mailto:sadiatoma2813@gmail.com))

<b>Executive Editor's comments (29-Dec-22)</b>		<b>Author's response (21-Feb-2023)</b> <i>Please respond to all comments from the editor and reviewer(s). Indicate the line number(s) of the manuscript where the changes are done.</i>	
1.	Please use the Admin Checklist for revising the manuscript. All points must be answered.	1.	Administrative checklist has been answered for revising the manuscript.
2.	Introduction of the Abstract is lengthy. However, more flesh is needed for the Methods and Results.	2.	Abstract is edited according to journal format (continuous format) Lines 62-93, Page 3.
3.	Remove table numbers from tables 1-3. Describe them in texts. Table contents can be given in bullet points.	3.	Removal done and table contents are given in bullet points, Lines 178-185, Pages 6-7.
4.	Tables 4 and 5 could be presented in one table. Tables 6-8 could be presented in one table.	4.	Tables 4 & 5 are compiled into table I (Page 6). Table 6 is renamed to table II and placed in a separate table (Page 17). Otherwise it might look clumsy. Tables 7 & 8 are compiled into table III (Page 18).
5.	Please do a grammar check.	5.	Carefully done.
<b>Editor's Decision</b>			
	a. Minor revision		
	b. Major revision	✓	
	c. Reject		

<b>Reviewer's comments</b>		<b>Author's response</b>	
Date review assigned	05-Dec-22	Date sent to author	29-Dec-22
Date review returned	09-Dec-22	Date received from author	21-Feb-23
Reviewer name, affiliation, email, ORCID	Saidur Rahman Mashreky, Director NCD & Mental Health, CIPRB <a href="mailto:mashreky@ciprb.org">mashreky@ciprb.org</a> 0000-0001-7892-798X		
Conflict of interest of the reviewer	None		
<b>Please write Yes or No</b>		Please write a response if the reviewer's comment is No. You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.	
1.	Is the research question or study objective clearly defined in measurable terms?	Yes	-
2.	Is the abstract accurate, balanced and complete?	Yes	-
3.	Is the study design appropriate to answer the research question or achieve objective?	No	Study design has changed to analytical cross sectional study (Lines 151-152, Page 5).
4.	Are the Methods described sufficiently to allow others to repeat it?	Yes	-
5.	Are the operational definitions and ascertainment of key variables given adequately?	Yes	-
6.	Are the outcomes clearly defined?	Yes	-
7.	Are statistics used appropriately and described fully?	Yes	-
8.	Do the Results address the research question or objective clearly?	Yes	-
9.	Are the tables and figures clear and appropriate to address the objective or research question?	Yes	-

10. Does the Discussion cover the main points of the paper?	Yes	-
11. Are the strengths and limitations addressed?	No	In discussion, the strengths and limitations have been added (Lines 287-301, Page 11).
12. Are the conclusions justified by the results	Yes	-
13. Are the references up-to-date, and appropriate?	No	Seven references are added from article published on 2015 and afterwards time period (Lines 386-409, Pages 14-15, References 25-27, 29-31, 33).
14. Is the standard of written English acceptable for publication?	Yes	-
<b>15. Descriptive comments</b> to the authors (Divide it into MAJOR and MINOR points).		Respond and reflect it in your manuscript. If you refute, justify your argument using references. Mention line numbers.
Thank you, authors, for conducting a fascinating study in the field of hematological malignancies. In my understanding, this study result can help generate further hypotheses for future research.		
1. The study was designed to determine the association between the degree of bone marrow fibrosis and MVD with CD34 endothelial markers. This kind of objective need an analytic study design, and the author can modify the study objective, which can be accommodated in the cross-sectional study design.		1. Study design has changed to analytical cross sectional study (Lines 151-152, Page 5).
2. Many references are old		2. Seven recent references are added from article published on 2015 and afterwards time period (Lines 386-409, Pages 14-15, References 25-27, 29-31, 33).
<b>Reviewer's Recommendation</b> (Tick mark on the open boxes to the right)	d. Minor revision	
	e. Major revision	√
	f. Reject	

## Second round

Executive Editor's comments (21-Feb-23)	Author's response (22-Feb-2023)
Please provide the following information's in your manuscript according to the journal's guideline: 1. Line number is missing. 2. Abstract will be in single page. 3. Provide 3 to 5 highlights of your study in a single page. 4. Author contributions section has not been given as per admin checklist. 5. DOI is missing for all references. 6. The limit of the number of tables/ illustrations for original article is up to 6.	1. Provided the page line numbers. 2. Abstract has given in a single page. 3. Given the Highlights in single page. 4. Given the author's contributions. 5. DOI of all references have given. 6. Reduced the number of Table according to the journal's guideline.

## Third round

Executive Editor's comments (23-Feb-23)	Author's response (25-Feb-2023)
Note that your author's contribution section is still incomplete. Please follow the flowing points as per journal's guideline a. Conception and design b. Acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of data c. Manuscript drafting and revising it critically d. Approval of the final version of manuscript e. Guarantor of accuracy and integrity of the work f. Data Collection	Author's contribution section has been provided as per journal's guideline.