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Reviewer's report:

In case presentation, could you elaborate about the patient's presentation at birth. It would be helpful for the readers if authors organized patient's presentation as a timeline or systematically mention according to the months from 1 month to 11 months (or the time of surgical intervention).

On page 10, line 238, authors mentioned, "although it was well known that ERT does not prevent cardiac glycosaminoglycan deposits." Stabilization of valvular disease has been observed in some patients (Braunlin et al. 2011). Stabilization or even a slower deterioration may be suggested a favorable contribution for the rapidly growing or in case of progressive nature of MPS VI (Scarpa et al. 2009).

Regarding page 6, line 147: in case of severe form or rapidly progressing disease where the symptoms may be present at birth, usually diagnosis gets sooner than between the 2nd and 3rd birthdays.

At the end of the conclusion, on page 11, after line 269, authors may acknowledge about the prospect or the importance of the newborn screening (NBS) which can lead to early diagnosis and treatment for MPS VI. If ERT can start within first few months of life after diagnosis may prevent cardiac valves involvement (Braunlin et al. 2011)

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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