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Reviewer's report:
This revised manuscript is much improved from the original, specifically with changing the wording of the hypothesis to look at "number of cholangitis episodes" as a predictive factor for LT. The authors did a good job to adequately address both reviewers' comments. While the actual difference between number of cholangitis episodes at 2 years post-KPE is relatively small (2.2 versus 3.5), this reaches statistical significance. As food for thought - another way of interpreting this data would be to say that the "early" episodes of cholangitis (defined as <1 year after KPE does not make a difference in progression to LT), but episodes of cholangitis between ages 1-2 may suggest that LT is more likely.

Overall, this is a large cohort and is a valuable study for the pediatric liver field, which could stimulate more prospective studies to include histology, biochemical parameters, and other factors to better examine how repeated cholangitis might predispose or signal disease progression and LT.

Very minor optional revisions:
- lines 193-194: "...although the findings of one other study..." = I would suggest being more specific as to the particular findings that the authors are referring to, or to just remove that phrase all together.
- lines 212-213: This sentence is speculation - should add, "We would speculate that a greater number of cholangitis episodes..."
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