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Reviewer's report:
In the revision, the authors have addressed the concerns raised by reviewers to the best of their ability. It makes a more balanced overview of a true problem the clinician faces. I only have three suggestions. Firstly, I think important for "immune mediated" to be added to title. Secondly, I think they should make important point that in light of potential side-effects of immune treatment, AE criteria is pragmatically made more stringent when no biomarker of inflammation can be found; and by contrast can be relaxed if a known clinically relevant antibody is identified. Ultimately the treatment if these groups of patients are based on the empirical evidence accrued to the best of ability and is far from definitive currently. Finally, I think the cases reported do not allow them to make a conclusion of wide spectrum of neuropsychiatric manifestation of AE. Instead, it should be reformulated as that there is heterogeneous presentation of neuropsychiatric features in children whereby an autoimmune (or immune-mediated) aetiology should be investigated with well established guidelines but that management is difficult and not definitive when no biomarker (define perhaps) can be identified.
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