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Reviewer's report:

I reviewed revised version of the above article and I also read other reviewer's comments with interest.

Authors addressed some of my criticisms and they somehow handled NK contradiction in discussion section. Authors emphasized CD56bright NK cells and its functional link to T lymphocytes an chronic inflammation as explanation of NK result inconsistency pointed out in my original review but still mention NK result in abstract results as reliable conclusion of the study.

I believe that percentages of patients switched to other treatments (however not included in statistical analysis) should be mentioned in the text and results and not only as a footnote to tables.

In clinical data section authors should be consistent and show numbers but also percentages (after 48 month 114 patients (59.6%)....and (69 the third one).... what was a percentage and mention third relapse (not the "third one"); possibly graph with percentages would be suitable option here.

My original proposition that authors should put accent on naive cells should be re-considered.

From my point of view article is still not "friendly" to general medical professional and I absolutely agree with the last sentence of revised article.

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

Yes

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

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
No

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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Quality of written English
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