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Reviewer's report:

The authors report a rare case of pediatric recurrent rhabdomyolysis with compound heterogenous variants in the LPIN1. The case report is interesting because it is necessary to sensitize pediatricians to the diagnosis of rhabdomyolysis, and to the diagnosis of rhabdomyolysis due to mutations in the LPIN1 gene. This diagnosis is still rare in Asia. This type of case report should be encouraged.

Some correction suggestions:

Abstract:
- LPIN1 in italic (and in the text)
- symptoms of rhabdomyolysis: do not start with myoglobinuria which was probably not the first symptom
- specify the age for the two episodes of rhabdomyolysis and the level of blood CK

Discussion:
- clarify what is Haff disease in the text
- I don't understand the following sentence: The study from France indicated that in LPIN1-deficiency patients without infection, if plasma lactate levels remained normal during efforts, cytokines, known as the trigger of myolysis, would not be dosed during exercise. We don't measure cytokines for the diagnosis and during exercise.
- A sentence on the importance of this diagnosis to prepare future decompensations: as soon as there is a risk factor, and of course as soon as there is a symptom, hospitalize the patient to hydrate as soon as possible and prepare for severe rhabdomyolysis with possible heart rhythm disorder

Figure: improve the quality of the two figures.
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.
Unable to assess

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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