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**Reviewer's report:**

The work, well done and methodologically correct, presents data that are already known in the literature, but re-evaluated through the use of ROC analysis.

Minor clarifications are required:

**METHODS:**

1. which were the clinical reasons that led to the performance of endoscopic duodenal biopsy?
2. Why are they used different commercial tests? Are there differences between them in their diagnostic capability?

**RESULTS:** page 9 and ten, it is claimed that Ema were detected in 18 children from group B. Twelve of these EMA-positive children showed mucosal healing. To explain about what that statement was based.
3. Children still had positive EMA ranging from 1:5 to 1:80 despite Marsh of class 0. clarify the correlation, your data, among EMA, TG2-and DGP with the different degree of the Marsh lesion. Recent literature has shown a different interpretation of these cases by the use of duodenal mucosa cultures.

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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