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A systematic review and meta-analysis of the prevalence of thrombosis and bleeding at diagnosis of Philadelphia-negative myeloproliferative neoplasms.

The manuscript is very interesting and useful. However there are some points that the authors need to clarify. In the introduction they need to mention why is important to know the prevalence of thrombosis and bleeding at diagnosis of Philadelphia-negative myeloproliferative neoplasms. It is interesting, but why is it point important?

The authors decided that before of a conclusion on the prevalence or thrombosis and bleeding they must do a systematic review, this is an interesting point. But they did not discuss why the prevalence in the different populations is not equal. They mention some points in the discussion, but they do not analyze each point. If during the time the criteria for defining Philadelphia-negative myeloproliferative neoplasms have changed they must mention which are these changes. This aspect would be sufficient to explain the differences in the prevalence.

The other point that they mention is the population from the studies were done. However they do not discuss this point how affected the results. For example they mention that the prevalence would vary for the different populations. But why is it? The prevalence of thrombosis and bleeding at diagnosis would be different by race or demographic characteristics of the populations? I believe that not. But, it is most probable that the differences in the technology for identifying thrombosis or bleeding in these patients would be affecting the prevalence.

They used the Prisma criteria but they did not mention why they did not make a stratification by the quality of the studies.

Minor comment: For me it is not clear the definition of cohort that they used in theirs study.
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