

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hematology

ESPS manuscript NO: 23508

Title: Changing insights in the diagnosis and classification of autosomal recessive and dominant von Willebrand diseases 1980-2015

Reviewer's code: 00542396

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2015-11-30 10:18

Date reviewed: 2015-12-22 16:44

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | BPG Search: | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Although the authors have performed a right effort summarizing and updating the bast amount of information available and scientifically accepted regarding the ways of diagnosis and classification among the possible variants of von Willebrand disease, there are so many mistakes in the text (mainly spelling and format errors) that I must not recommend it for been published in WJH in its present form. Several examples of these mistakes are following detailed: - VWF: while some part of the text it is written correctly, sometimes it appears vWF (please read carefully the second paragraph of the introduction section) - "Golgi netwotk" should read "Golgi network". - First subheading of the introduction: not all the heading is in bold, but also not all heading have the same format throughout the text. - "figure" should read consistently, but author often use capital letter. - "figure 4D show" it should be written like "figure 4D shows". (Check it in all text) - "these degraded fragment were": should read "fragments". - Although IUPOAC accept both ml and mL, please could you write it consistently during the text. - Please read carefully page 7, but particularly the second paragraph contains almost one mistake in each sentence. - Table 2, when referred to type 3: it seems



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

that this sentence is uncompleted. - Please be sure that you have the publication right for reproducing figures already published in other journal, since they would hold the copyrights of the figures presented in the present review. Apart of this legal issue. Authors just scanned the figures from the original sources; hence they are so poor quality for being used in the present publication. Could you please reproduce them with better quality? - Regarding references section, I have found a huge inconsistency in the format how authors have referenced other publications.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hematology

ESPS manuscript NO: 23508

Title: Changing insights in the diagnosis and classification of autosomal recessive and dominant von Willebrand diseases 1980-2015

Reviewer's code: 01021289

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2015-11-30 10:18

Date reviewed: 2015-12-18 09:56

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|---|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | BPG Search: | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

General comments This is a review article on the diagnosis and classification of von Willebrand disease by JJ Michiels et al. The authors detailed the molecular basis, mutations, classification and diagnostic differentiation of the disease. In general, the manuscript is very dense. Although this manuscript detailed the fundamental information of the disease, the authors failed to provide the aim of this article, issues and limitations associated with the diagnosis or treatment of von-Willebrand disease. The bottom line of the manuscript along with these points should be stated more plainly. In addition, the conclusion or the summary statement is missing at the end of the manuscript. Instead of putting overwhelmingly too many information, the authors are encouraged to summarize each paragraph precise and to the point. **Specific comments** Major 1. Abstract is written too dense and hard to follow. It is simply filled with diagnostic laboratory investigations and molecular basis of the disease. It lacks background, the aim of this article and issues and limitations associated with the diagnosis or treatment of von-Willebrand disease. The background, the aim of this article and issues and limitations associated with the diagnosis or treatment of von-Willebrand disease should be



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

included without describing too much detail of the molecular basis of the disease. This would help the readers easy to follow. 2. At the end of the article, the conclusive statement or the summary of this work needs to be provided. 3. The title of the manuscript states that “changing insights in the diagnosis and classification of von Willebrand diseases 1980-2015”. It is not obvious if this point is emphasized in the manuscript. If this is what the authors wish to highlight, it needs to be stressed in the abstract, introduction and in the summary statement. 4. There are 9 paragraphs in the manuscript. It starts with Introduction, which is written well, followed by other 8 paragraphs. Some of the paragraphs brought up the details without providing sufficient background information, which made them hard to follow. Minor 1. A number of Typos are found throughout the manuscript.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hematology

ESPS manuscript NO: 23508

Title: Changing insights in the diagnosis and classification of autosomal recessive and dominant von Willebrand diseases 1980-2015

Reviewer's code: 01553776

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2015-11-30 10:18

Date reviewed: 2015-12-20 08:01

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|--|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | BPG Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major points: Thank you for this very meticulous review on VWD. VWD is a very complicated and difficult-to-handle disease for hematologists. As stated, it consists of various subtypes and inherits in recessive or dominant manner. This excellent review deals with the progress of pathogenesis explored in the past. However, it does not kindly provide for clinicians with how to manage VWD up-to-date. Ideally, if it is prepared in two ways, it helps for readers of this review. First is how to diagnose VWD at the bedside. Minimum lists of mandatory laboratory tests are welcome. Secondary, as a next step, please explain why detailed classification of subtypes (to what extent?) is necessary in the VWD patients' care. Currently, what kinds of procedures are best performed for this classification in the special laboratories. In the review, the impact of genetic mutation studies is not clearly stated. Minor points: (1) In the Abstract, genetic mutations are mentioned; however, in the Core tip, the significance of genetic studies is not emphasized. (2) There are two Figure 15 (3) Figure 12 and Figure 15 are not in good quality. (4) Some misspellings; Is multmeric multimeric? Is ebsent absent? Is lowe lower?, etc.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Hematology

ESPS manuscript NO: 23508

Title: Changing insights in the diagnosis and classification of autosomal recessive and dominant von Willebrand diseases 1980-2015

Reviewer's code: 02610229

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2015-11-30 10:18

Date reviewed: 2015-12-17 01:58

| CLASSIFICATION | LANGUAGE EVALUATION | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT | CONCLUSION |
|--|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing | Google Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected | BPG Search: | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a review article that summarizes the diagnosis and classification of von Willebrand factor disease. 1) The article is very comprehensive and has captured the evidence presented in the literature. Although I have no concerns with the scientific aspect of the manuscript, the English language used is very unconventional. For example on page 4, endoplasmatic reticulum and exostosis are used instead of endoplasmic reticulum and exocytosis. These are just two examples, the entire manuscript need to be reviewed again for English to remove numerous typos and grammatical error that makes it difficult to read. 2) The number of figure can also be reduced. 3) The review should end with a brief conclusion, wherein the authors should summarize their thoughts about the strengths and weakness of the current classification system. This will likely help the readers comprehend the topic better.