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This is a retrospective study analyzing the impact of IgM deposits on renal biopsy on clinical course and outcome of nephrotic syndrome (NS) in children.

The authors defined IgM nephropathy as presence of IgM mesangial deposition on immunofluorescence (IF) and divided patients into IgM+ and IgM- groups for further analysis.

- In Methods (Patient selection), on page 3, line 58, the authors introduced abbreviation "MH" without explanation. Does MH stand for mesangial hypercellularity?

- The conclusions of the study are somewhat confusing: the conclusion of the abstract says that there is no difference in clinical course and disease outcome between with IgM-positive and IgM-negative patients. However, the conclusion at the end of the article (page 11, lines 199-200) suggests that IgM induced glomerular injury leads to challenging disease due to tendency for steroid resistance and the need for more immunosuppressive agents - this statement would indicate that patients with IgM positivity have a more severe clinical course. Please clarify and unify the conclusion in the abstract with the conclusion at the end of the manuscript.

- The tables are embedded into the text of the article. Usually, all the tables and figures are placed at the end of the manuscript.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
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**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
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**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable

**Declaration of competing interests**
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal