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Reviewer's report:

The paper is a retrospective descriptive analysis of bone marrow results in the country of Eritrea. The authors do a thorough job of describing the mix of cases observed. This revised manuscript is an improvement on the original, but still has some areas of weakness or difficulty in readability. Without the original comments from the original reviewers (only the replies are included) it is difficult to assess whether all concerns were addressed and whether all changes were directly in response to previous reviewer comments. Throughout the paper there are numerous errors of English grammar so that additional editing for English grammar would improve the readability.

Background/Methods:

1) Under "Study population" I would not delete that Asmara is the capital city of Eritrea or at least provide some frame of reference for the site. I for one do not know what Asmara is without that information. Also it is a little unclear whether the laboratory is the only one in Asmara or the only one in Eritrea that has the hematopathology capabilities. As it is written right now it reads that it is the only lab in Asmara with these capabilities which would lead one to think there may be additional cases in other labs in Eritrea that are not included in this report. I would guess from the remaining text in this section that it is not the case and that this lab is the referenc lab in Eritrea which receives all such samples. Please clarify.

Results:

Overall this section is acceptable with improved tables

Discussion:

1) In the first paragraph it is unclear why the authors reference studies citing lymphomas in reference to gender ratios when lymphomas were not included in this analysis.
2) Throughout the discussion the authors include numbers of patients that fall into a variety of categories, but without some denominator included it is difficult to assess the impact of these numbers without having to flip back to the tables that report total numbers. While the authors comments indicate percentages were removed in many places throughout the article presumably in response to previous reviewers comments, in the discussion either a percentage or a denominator should be included in each case for convenience in reading.

3) The last paragraph of the discussion is simply a listing of the prevalence of CBC findings and is really just a repeat summary of results. This simple list of results is not appropriate or necessary in the discussion and rather should include simply a discussion or explanation of the relevance of the findings, not another list of the results.

4) "Limitations of the study" isn't usually a separate section and rather can just be incorporated into the discussion.

**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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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