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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear reviewers

First of all we would like to thank you for taking your time to give us those important comments which would empower the research article. We have tried to correct the comments one by one and we look forward to hear from you.

Reviewer 1:

1. We have removed the abbreviations from the abstract which were in line 27 and 28.

2. We have also corrected the conclusion as per the comments. The study was not designed to estimate the prevalence but to study the pattern and distribution of HM in terms of age, gender, most common clinical presentation and pattern of the CBC.

3. We have included the method of how the bone marrow aspiration was analyzed.

4. We have changed the first line of discussion line 42 by giving more importance to the focus of the study.
5. Taking the comment and as the sample size was small we have omitted the comment in gender preponderance and tried to depict it in tabular form. Result section line 23 to 26.

6. We have shortened the background to data only pertinent to the study.

Reviewer 2:
1. While shortening the background, we have removed the whole paragraph and have thus removed the need for CML to be included.

2. We have included that bone marrow aspirations were ordered if the patients were clinically suspected of having HMs, visceral leishmaniasis and pancytopenia in the “Methods” section. The indication of bone marrow aspiration was to diagnose HMs. Yet, there were no mentions of lymphomas in our data.

3. We have combined table one and two and removed the total from the bottom of the tables. All percentages have also been removed.

4. We have reviewed the data and the numbers still are the same. As this is a retrospective study, we have to rely on the data from the laboratory.

Reviewer 3
Title
1. We have removed the time period

2. We have removed the type of study

Abstract
1. We have removed the time period from the background

2. “to” has been inserted

3. All abbreviations have been removed

4. “was” has been replaced by “were”

5. Units have been provided to all parameters

6. The keyword change has been accepted
Background

1. This section has been significantly reduced and only data pertaining to the study has been kept.

Methods

1. The aspirations site and method has been explained.

2. We have included that CBC was done by an automated counter.

3. We couldn’t find if there were any dry taps or inadequate materials. Only results of those who had undergone microscopic examination were available.

4. “Were” has been inserted.

Results

1. We have removed all duplications.

2. Units have been provided to all parameters.

3. “Undergone” has been inserted.

4. “To” has been inserted.

5. HM has been inserted in all necessary places.

Table 1 and 2

1. Percentages have been removed from all tables.

2. “Abbreviation” has been used instead of Key.

3. Table two has been merged with table one.
Table 3
1. We have simplified this table according to the instructions and all percentages have been removed.

Table 4
1. Units have been provided for each parameter.
2. Percentages have been removed.

Discussion
1. Same wording has been used throughout the text.
2. “Had” has been inserted.
3. “Limitation of Study” has been placed at the end of “Discussion”.

Conclusion
1. The conclusion has been shortened to just a few sentences.
2. The comment given regarding the WBC count has been accepted.
3. The “differential diagnosis” has been removed.

Reference
1. The comment regarding literature review has been accepted.
2. Journal citation format has been adjusted according to recommendations.
3. Reference numbering errors have been corrected.
4. Authors first names have been adjusted according to recommendations.
5. Official journal format has been adopted (UKJPB).
6. Recommendation on “references 7” has been done.

7. During shortening of the background, Reference 11 has been removed.

8. During shortening of the background, Reference 16 has been removed.

9. DOI numbers have been removed.

10. Author names have been adjusted accordingly.

11. Hossain et al has been corrected accordingly.

12. Official abbreviation for “Br J Cancer” has been inserted.