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Reviewer's report:

I still think this is a very interesting and important case study since a possible Felty's syndrome is unusual in children and case reports are important. The manuscript has improved but I have a few further suggestions.

Page 4, Line 31. The parenthesis can be removed, this refers to the earlier Table 1.

Page 9, Line 14-17. I guess that you mean Table 1 and 2.

Page 10, Line 5. I guess that you mean Fig 3.

Table 2. It is very difficult to get an overview of this table. I still think you should present the overall results in another way. Why not remove the table and sum up the most important results and present it in the text.

Table 4. If you want to keep this table I suggest that you explain that it covers only six children with FS and that you mention the number of those six patients with specific features instead of words like "always". It is hard to assume that a clinical feature will be mandatory in pediatric FS when we only have six patients described so far. Regarding "arthritis" as well as "splenomegaly" I suggest that you write "in all six" instead of "always". "Almost always" should be changed to "common". Regarding the column "autoantibody", "almost always" should be changed to "common" and "sometimes" to three out of six.

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.

No
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:
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