

## ANSWERING REVIEWERS

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Hematology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 29628

**Title:** Allogeneic stem cell transplantation in chronic myeloid leukemia patients: Single center experience

**Reviewer's code:** 00505755

**Comments to authors:**

The manuscript reports the results of allogeneic stem cell transplantation in chronic myeloid leukemia, which is worth reading and knowing. In the discussion session, it is described that the patients treated with ASCT have higher progression-free survival rate than patients treated with imatinib. From these insights, the advantage of ASCT compared to the treatment with TKIs, or the importance of the timing of ASCT may be discussed more in detail. In the first line treatment of CP-CML sub-section in the treatment of CML section, the reason for utilizing the combination of imatinib, nilotinib and dasatinib may be discussed. It would improve the practice of readers especially those who are considering the treatment for the patients with CML.

**Response:**

The importance of the timing of ASCT is discussed more.

In the first line treatment of CP-CML sub-section in the treatment of CML section, the reason for utilizing the combination of TKIs is discussed.

**Reviewer's code:** 02446101

**Comments to authors:**

In all, this article was written well. The research results are meaningful and the method is appropriate. However, there are still some language mistakes, for example, the 'miminal' in page 5 should be spelt as 'minimal'. To sum up, I think this manuscript can be accepted after minor revision.

**Response:**

Some language mistakes are corrected.

**Reviewer's code:** 01021289

**Comments to authors:**

This manuscript describes the allogeneic stem cell transplantation for the patients with CML. They reviewed the literature and presented authors' experience in their institute. The manuscript is well-written and educational for the hematologists and residents that provide health care for the patients with CML. However, a number of grammatical errors are found throughout the manuscript. They must be corrected. Minor comments: 1. In the case series, 10 cases were presented. However, the manuscript in the same section states that there were one patient who did not received imatinib, 1 subject that demonstrated primary resistance to imatinib, and 9 cases that lost response to imatinib, which is calculated as 11 cases. How many patients were analyzed, 10 or 11? Please make it clear. 2. There are a number of errors where the verb is grammatically

incorrect. For instance, Line 2 in the core tip on page 3, "TKIs were provided" should be "TKIs provided". Line 1 in the TREATMENT of CML on page 6, "(TKI), was improved the 10 year survival" should be "(TKI), improved the 10 year survival". Line 8 on page 10, "Five patients were died" should be "Five patients died". Line 2 in the discussion on page 10, "HLA-match" should be "HLA-matched". Line 3 in the discussion on page 10, "It was showed" should be "It was shown". Line 7 in the discussion on page 10, "Other reports were showed" should be "Other reports showed". Line 7 from the bottom on page 11 (discussion section), "Another study was demonstrated" should be "Another study demonstrated". Line 1 from the bottom on page 11 (discussion section), "ASCT did not increased" should be "ASCT did not increase". Line 5 on page 12, "prospective study was evaluated differences" should be "prospective study evaluated differences". Line 11 on page 12, "The studies were demonstrated that" should be "The studies demonstrated that". Line 2 in the Donor source on page 14, "they were compared" should be "they compared". Line 4 in the CONCLUSION on page 15, "Non-myeloablative ASCT is seems" should be "Non-myeloablative ASCT seems". I found similar errors in throughout the manuscript. The authors must correct the errors.

**Response:**

Grammatical errors are corrected.( Line 2 in the core tip on page 3, "TKIs were provided" should be "TKIs provided". Line 1 in the TREATMENT of CML on page 6, "(TKI), was improved the 10 year survival" should be "(TKI), improved the 10 year survival". Line 8 on page 10, "Five patients were died" should be "Five patients died". Line 2 in the discussion on page 10, "HLA-match" should be "HLA-matched". Line 3 in the discussion on page 10, "It was showed" should be "It was shown". Line 7 in the discussion on page 10, "Other reports were showed" should be "Other reports showed". Line 7 from the bottom on page 11 (discussion section), "Another study was demonstrated" should be "Another study demonstrated". Line 1 from the bottom on page 11 (discussion section), "ASCT did not increased" should be "ASCT did not increase". Line 5 on page 12, "prospective study was evaluated differences" should be "prospective study evaluated differences". Line 11 on page 12, "The studies were demonstrated that" should be "The studies demonstrated that". Line 2 in the Donor source on page 14, "they were compared" should be "they compared". Line 4 in the CONCLUSION on page 15, "Non-myeloablative ASCT is seems" should be "Non-myeloablative ASCT seems". I found similar errors in throughout the manuscript. The authors must correct the errors.

Number of patients is corrected. (1. In the case series, 10 cases were presented. However, the manuscript in the same section states that there were one patient who did not received imatinib, 1 subject that demonstrated primary resistance to imatinib, and 9 cases that lost response to imatinib, which is calculated as 11 cases. How many patients were analyzed, 10 or 11? Please make it clear.)