

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 55851

**Title:** Primary myelofibrosis with concurrent CALR and MPL mutations: A case report

**Reviewer's code:** 00068723

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Occupational Physician

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Japan

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-04-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-09-17 06:47

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-09-20 04:28

**Review time:** 2 Days and 21 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The authors reported a case of myelofibrosis subjected to next generation sequencing. They found mutations in CALR, MPL, and PIK3RI. The results were intriguing, but the presented clinical data were immature. It was hard to imagine the patient with the presented data. Results of blood examination were absent. They should be presented in Tables. CT was performed, but the images were absent. The authors said that the patient had splenomegaly. It would be better to show the spleen with the CT. Bone marrow biopsy was performed. The photos of bone marrow should be presented. The reason was not clear how ruxolitinib was administered. Brief information on treatment strategy for primary myelofibrosis was necessary. Not all the readers are specialist on hematology. Part of Introduction should be spent on the information on CALR, MPL and PIK3RI. How would the authors speculate the biological significance of the mutations of CALR, MPL and PIK3RI. Did the authors conclude that ruxolitinib failed? If so, was the mutations related with the treatment failure? If ruxolitinib improved the clinical cause of patient, did the mutations affect the effects of the agent?

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 55851

**Title:** Primary myelofibrosis with concurrent CALR and MPL mutations: A case report

**Reviewer's code:** 01036411

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Italy

**Author's Country/Territory:** China

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-04-05

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jin-Lei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-09-17 06:35

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-09-20 15:16

**Review time:** 3 Days and 8 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

The authors reported on a case of primary myelofibrosis in whom NGS analysis found mutations in CALR, MPL and PIK3RI genes. The case deserves mention since both the mutations combination is rare and MPL mutation is atypical. Major criticisms - The description of the case deserves more information. One would expect the report of serum LDH, and cholesterol; one expect classification in term of prognostic score (IPSS). On expect a more detailed description of bone marrow biopsy, in particular presence of clusters of megakaryocytes, description of nuclear anomalies of megakaryocytes, and myeloid cellularity. - One common challenge of NGS is to differentiate acquired somatic mutations from germline pathogenic variants. This may be done by mutation detection in germline control samples (e.g., skin fibroblasts, saliva). Also high and stable VAF (e.g., 40-50%) at follow-up may be indicative for germline alteration. The doubt about the possibility of a germline mutation of MPL must be solved.