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Reviewer's report:

1. Abstract - I would be careful to say that this data suggests IOP rises are seen "more often" in pediatric patients given the low n, rather I would say this study confirms IOP rises may also occur in the pediatric population and should be monitored and treated appropriately. This point is again raised in the discussion, and the authors state it is not clear why there is a difference in the % of patients who have IOP rises, and again, the low n makes this

2. Background - MTX is often the first choice, recommend avoiding absolutes in statements like this.

3. Patient 2 - Mentions he is 9, chart says 8 years old. Please adjust for consistency.

4. Patient 3 - Would like to know how long the patient remained stable on the reduced dose of MTX. Would interesting to note as to efficacy of DEX in helping to lower need for maintenance therapy.

I would like to see some comment on expected course of disease after the 6 month treatment period, given the attempted decrease in systemic therapy, especially considering many readers would expect recurrent disease at 6 months after the implant wears off.

Overall nicely done.

No controls were necessary, nor would controls be ethical in this study.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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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?
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
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published

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.

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