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Reviewer's report:

Dear author,

Thank you for this high quality research. However, you need to make the following corrections:

1) The paper is very long (56 pages) and very difficult to finish. It should be made much shorter especially that there are unnecessary details in the methods. No need for so much technical details.

2) Why did you use two classification systems for MDS especially that the FAB system is very old. What is the benefit of this dual classification? It is better to rely on the recent WHO system because RAEB has changed to RAEB1 and RAEB2 while RAEBt has been changed to AML by definition(blast percentage >20%).

Are the methods appropriate and well described?

If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?

If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?

If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?

If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.
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