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Reviewer’s report:

The authors present an interesting manuscript reporting a population-based study investigating the incidence rates of Celiac Disease and EoE (really, esophageal eosinophilia). Overall the manuscript is well written and statistically sound. I submit the following Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. In the first paragraph, the authors report that the incidence of EoE has risen dramatically over the past decade, yet the data in table 1 do not show this to be the case at least for the pediatric subpopulation.

2. The inclusion of both Table 1 and Figure 1 appear redundant. Figures do not have Titles provided.

3. The authors need to explore further the difference in IR in total vs pediatric cohorts- have the adult biopsy practices changed in their adult groups that may explain these apparent rises as ascertainment bias?


4. The current EoE consensus guidelines (Liacouras, JACI, 2011) note Celiac Disease as associated with Esophageal Eosinophilia as distinct from EoE. This combined with the relatively unknown clinical criteria for EoE in the 3 subjects, really suggest that these subjects are best termed as having esophageal eosinophilia. Certainly a controversial topic, but one could argue that PPI responsive esophageal eosinophilia has not been excluded, and Esophageal eosinophilia in the context of duodenitis does not meet the definitions for EoE.

5. Table 2 - what happened to the esophageal eosinophilia when wheat was eliminated and the duodenitis resolved on repeat endoscopy?

6. Page 4-5 - the authors need to emphasize why there study is an important contribution to the literature that is not present in the studies described.

7. Methods - search terminology? Could the search terminology have underestimated either Celiac or EoE cases?
8. Methods - again appears to be histologic esophageal eosinophilia vs EoE by current criteria

9. Page 9 - given that there were only 3 subjects identified, I wonder about contacting these patients

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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