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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor and Reviewer:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewer’s comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Comparison between clinical features and prognosis of malignancy- and non-malignancy–associated pediatric hemophagocytic lymphohistiocytosis” (ID: BPED-D-18-00244). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. Revised portion are marked in red in the paper. The main correction in the paper and the responds to the reviewer’s comments are as following:

Responds to the Editor Comments:

Technical Comments:

1. “In the section “Ethics approval and consent to participate” in the Declarations, please give the reference numbers for the ethical approval.”

Response: no: 20161013 (Ethics approval and consent to participate section, line 15-16, page 12).

2. “Please include information on the Consent to Participate in the section Ethics approval and consent to participate.”
Response: The protocol has been designed and the study will be conducted in line with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki (1964) (Ethics approval and consent to participate section, line 16-17, page 12).

3. Please describe the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

Response: This study is supported by the Affiliated University of Qingdao University. Editorial support was funded by Li-rong Sun. (Funding section, line 2-3, page 12).

Responds to STATISTICAL REVIEWER COMMENTS

4. The authors have addressed almost all the issues raised previously. Still, they have just mentioned '… retrospectively reviewed …' in study design. Specify whether it was cross-sectional or historical cohort (seems with the long study duration from January 2005 to October 2016) or time series or any other. Also, it would be better if they indicated the modifications made in the manuscript in different color.

Response: A retrospective historical cohort study was carried out. (Methods section, line 7, page 4) and, we indicated the modifications made in the manuscript in red color.

5. Odds ratio (with the confidence interval) could also be computed for 2X2 categories such as gender (male, female) and (M-HLH, N-M-HLH) and other sets of 2X2 categories.

Response: We have computed the Odds ratio for the 2X2 Chi-square test and Z value for Mann-Whitney U test (table1).

6. Did you also check the sensitivity and the specificity of the 18-point diagnostic criteria proposed by Delavigne et al.?

Response: We did not check the sensitivity and the specificity of the 18-point diagnostic criteria proposed by Delavigne et al this time, but we will consider it later.

Thank you and best regards.

Sincerely Yours,

Hua Pan