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**Reviewer's report:**

This is an interesting and well written report about initial presentation of angioedema attacks in children. I think this adds important knowledge to the field.

However, I do not feel that one of the conclusions is supported by the data. Specifically as this is an observational study, the conclusion that admission for short-term observation shortens the clinical course of patients with angioedema is not warranted. First, the duration was much longer for patient admitted to the hospital which is not surprising given they likely had more severe disease. Second, the difference between patients admitted to the observation unit and those sent home (2.1 vs. 2.3 days) is not clinically significant and may be influenced by other factors (data on one collected while in observation, the other on follow up, likely days later; different mechanisms of angioedema). Finally, the statistics presented just compare the 3 groups, meaning significance is likely due to the much longer duration in the group the was hospitalized. To conclude that observation caused more rapid resolution of symptoms (rather than it was simply associated with it) is not supported by the data presented here.

More minor comments

p 7, line 8 would say insect bites and stings

p7 line 15, would say clinician review not peer review
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Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is 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?
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