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Reviewer’s report:

I found this case report to be an interesting and accurate representation of the difficulties hepatologists have diagnosing biliary atresia in the complex NICU patient. I found the article to be easy to read, relevant, and straightforward. The images are clear and helpful. This case is interesting to publish, except I have a major revision that I feel need to be addressed before it can be published:

1) (Major revision) Many hepatologists use 60 days as the standard time by which Biliary Atresia should be diagnosed (see references below). This is still debated in the literature and not a black and white issue (see references), but is a generally accepted standard. However, this detail needs to be more directly addressed in the discussion of the case report especially since there was not a HIDA scan until after day 75 and liver biopsy until day 81. This timeframe is one of the most important discussion pieces when evaluating these complex NICU patients. It should also be discussed why this patient wasn't evaluated until after 60 days (there may be very valid reasons, but unless they are discussed the reader won't know about them), did prematurity play a role? What does the literature say about prematurity and the timing of Kasai?


2) Can the cholangiogram be included as an image?

3) Was there any other work up such as alpha-1-antitrypsin phenotype, etc?

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.

Yes

**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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Acceptable
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