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**Reviewer's report:**

The revised paper “Screening for inborn errors of metabolism in symptomatic children: a three-year study in Zhejiang Province, China” provides an important contribution to the literature.

There remain a few minor typographical errors

1. **Methods:**
   children were screened for metabolic diseases. Symptomatic children – the punctuation is missing

2. **Borderline cut-off values**
   The boarder line cut-off values - should be borderline cut-off values
   The the borderline cut-off value – should be The borderline

3. **Confirmatory Tests**
   Uropterin profile analysis, Aminoacidemias was confirmed by
   Needs redrafting ( I think the authors intended uropterin profile analysis be part of the previous sentence. As well the was should be were)

4. **Discussion**
  Totally 0.48% (62 patients) of 11,060 NB should be 0.56%
   which indicated the importance and impending need to improve the newborn screening cover rate around China. Do the authors mean important and imperative?

5. **References**
   In the Background the reference cited as 4 should be 2
   In Discussion 3 and 4 should be superscript

6. **Table 1**
   In a response to the previous submission the authors describe the borderline cut off as 4SD from the mean of results as seen in Table 1. Table 1 does not present this data as such. Are all samples with results outside the displayed range given further testing?
The quality of the written English in the Discussion needs some language correction.

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

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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