



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	International Blood Research & Reviews
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IBRR_50389
Title of the Manuscript:	Can histochemical c-mpl positivity in bone marrow be a predictor for splenectomy in immune thrombocytopenia?
Type of the Article	Short Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 1: 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)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Authors investigated c-mpl staining positivity in the marrow megakaryocytes of patients with ITP who were splenectomized as well as who were not splenectomized,</p> <p>Abstract: I would change this sentence because the meaning is somewhat confusing, Perhaps, the revised sentence could read: "Pre-splenectomy bone marrow was stained for c-mpl, that was taken from 24 patients with ITP and who had splenectomy as well as bone marrow samples from 30 patients with ITP who did not have splenectomy". Also in the "results" in the abstract, enter exact the number of c-MPL negative samples over the total number of samples for each group (splenectomized and non-splenectomized). Conclusion ;insert "be" after might Introduction; the reference 2 does not indicate that site of sequestration predicts response to splenectomy. In fact the conclusion was opposite. Materials and Methods: the 1st sentence of this section needs a revision as I suggested above. We would like to know more about these subjects, such as their baseline platelet counts, length of thrombocytopenia, age, reason for splenectomy, timing of splenectomy relative to the onset of ITP, any other comorbidity, etc. Please make a table indicating these specifics. Authors state that all splenectomized patients had chronic ITP, but do not mention regarding non-splenectomized patients. In reference to the immunohistochemical staining, describe the method more in detail. How many megakaryocytes per specimen were scored? How many observers were involved in the scoring? What was the interrater correlation in the scoring? Results and Discussion Authors state, "Splenectomy was not performed in the second group due to stable platelet count and response to the first line treatment such as the corticosteroid". This fact indicates that the non-splenectomized patients most likely had biologically a different disorder in comparison to the splenectomized patients, and in addition there was no clinically compelling reasons for splenectomy. It is the former group with refractory ITP who needs to be evaluated for success rate of splenectomy. Authors' conclusion, "the significant level of c-mpl negativity might be the useful parameter for splenectomy indication in patients with immune thrombocytopenia' has not been demonstrated in this study. The study rather showed that there was a significant difference in the megakaryocytes c-mpl expression between splenectomized patients and non-splenectomized patients. If the authors wanted to know if c-mpl expression can be used to predict response to splenectomy in chronic ITP patients, then they should look at a correlation between c-mpl positivity and response to splenectomy. On the other hand, the data may suggest that c-mpl expression is correlated with steroid responsive ITP. Authors may test this hypothesis using this material they have.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments		
Optional/General comments	<p>This paper needs major revisions. The data do not support the authors' conclusion. The materials and methods are too brief. They should include details as I indicated above. If the authors wish to re-investigate their data to find if the c-mpl positivity can predict the response to splenectomy, then they should re-write the entire manuscript.</p>	



[SDI Review Form 1.6](#)

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> Yes, but approval of ethical committee should be obtained.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Susumu Inoue
Department, University & Country	University College of Human Medicine, Michigan