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Reviewer's report:
Firstly, I would like to congratulate the authors for their work.

The present study is rather large but objective.

The theme is original and interesting, as it brings a new methodology that can improve the treatment of people with the low-risk myelodysplastic syndrome.

It is up to me to make comments to clarify and make the most useful article for the entire scientific community interested in the subject.

1. Abstract
1.1. Authors should place FSC and SSC in full, followed by acronyms.

2. Background

2.1. Second paragraph (line 4-6): The third sentence is confusing. Authors should improve the explanation and categorization of MDS types.

3. Methods
3.1. At the end of the first paragraph, remove the word "had" (this is repeated in the text).
3.2. Second paragraph: controls were matched according to gender. OK. But why did not they match the ages, too? Would placing a control containing adults be a bias to compare with their sample composed only of the elderly?

3.3. Page 9: Flow cytometry set-up and calibration. The site "HTTP://euroflow.org" is unnecessary in the text. Put in the references (available in ....) and flag in the text.

3.4. Page 12: End of the second paragraph. The website is unnecessary in the text. Put in the references (available in ....) and flag in the text.

3.5. Where are the ethical issues of the study ?? Please put in the text.

4. Result

4.1. Table 1: Authors should improve the presentation of data on the gender. it isn't good.

4.2. The data present in the table should be clear.


7. References

7.1. Review reference 11

7.2. Some references with large numbers of authors are written extensively (12), others with et al (21, 34). Authors should place the references according to the journal's standard.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
No

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 recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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