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Reviewer's report:

Additional comments:

1) Amend title to “retrospective study” and delete “pilot”. This does not seem like a pilot study or a clinical trial. This seems to be a retrospective study of outcomes in patients who received different therapies.

2) Design: Retrospective review? [Was this really a clinical trial? The authors seem to be reporting outcomes of patients treated according to clinical judgment, not according to a study protocol. I am still confused on this point]

3) These are males and females, not boys and girls [includes infants]

4) Amend this sentence per above: The aim of this retrospective and pilot study was to investigate whether dalteparin in the initial treatment phase is associated with a lower prevalence of coronary artery outcomes for patients with acute KD. [I believe the authors mean prevalence of CAL, not outcomes.]

5) What were the parents consenting to? The use of dalteparin? Or the use of their data in a review? What did the consent form actually say? Was it describing the experimental use of dalteparin? How many patients declined to participate? There is no such thing as a clinical trial with 100% enrollment. Were parents given a choice re: use of dalteparin? Still very unclear to me.

6) P. 12, line 18: “There were no patients presenting with CAL before the initial treatment in either cohort.” This is simply not possible! Please see Ogata et al. Int. J Cardiol. 2013 For rates of coronary artery lesions at initial echo. It is highly unlikely that ALL patients had a normal echocardiogram on admission. Please explain.

7) Define fever: give degrees in centigrade that you are calling “fever”.

8) P. 22, line 1: This study was hypothesis-generating. It did NOT establish anything! It suggests that a proper, randomized, placebo controlled trial might be worth pursuing to study the addition of dalteparin to current standard therapy.

9) P.23, line 11: Not clear what is meant by “excessive treatment”

10) Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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