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Reviewer's report:

This is a wonderful state of the art comprehensive review by leaders in the field and I agree with the authors its timely.

The only concern I have is the length of review and as such most of my minor suggestions below are to reduce text for brevity and increase readability.

I also suggest the title could be changed something like "Celiac disease: a comprehensive current review" or similar.

I would like to see the Abstract markedly reduced to a brief paragraph (or two at most of a few sentences each only) that mainly indicates why the authors feel this review is necessary at this time and what it will cover.

Page 4: line 21, please insert comma after identified', even in geriatric patients'; please delete "outbreak" and line 38 change 'extreme raise' to 'increase'; line 41, suggest delete 'often criticized, leaving' and change to '...the real cause of the risk in CD diagnoses remains unknown.'

Page 5: line 6, delete human and change 'disorder' to 'disorders'; line 14 delete '(so called invisible...iceberg); line 60, change to '... environmental changes that have reduced our exposure to pathogens.'

Line 41, would the authors like to comment here on the DQ8 mouse model of celiac disease? (Verdu and others)
Page 10: please add a reference line 6 after ecosystem; line 26 Firmicutes is a phyla and should not be in italics.

Page 11: line 16, suggest begin new paragraph after reference 70 and change to '...CD is more ...'; line 36, suggest new paragraph after reference 2.

Page 13-14: line 60, suggest change to '...European study showed diagnostic accuracy of ESPGHAN...'

Page 14: add reference line 9 after anti-tTG assays; line 45, change 'Most' to 'Many'.

Page 15, delete lines 16-24 'Macroscopically evident... and lymphoma.' I personally do not feel the current data supports DGP as being widely validated in comparison to EMA and TTG - would you consider to remove?

Page 16, add new paragraph line 11 after reference 110.

Page 17, line 11 suggest delete 'Despite it might...' so start at 'Histology remains...'; line 19 change 'Current indications' to 'Current recommendations are for four...'; line 45, start new paragraph after references 122-124.

Page 20, suggest you delete lines 29-33 as repetitive 'On the other hand...'; line 60 replace the comma at the end of the sentence with a full stop.

Page 21, I think the paragraph line 21 beginning 'Conversely, ...' flows well with the prior paragraph and does not need to be new.

Page 22, line 53, suggest new paragraph after '...improvement.'
Page 23, line 60, can you include the background risk for context.

Page 24, line 46, can limit ORs to one decimal place.

Page 25, I do not think the header should be restricted to adults, children also need careful follow up as you immediately outline in the first paragraph. However, on page 26, line 38 you might then want to add '... follow up duodenal biopsy in adults in order...' as the data is so limited for children.

Page 26, I would like you to comment more on GIP testing as this is very controversial and current.

Page 27, line 21, suggest new paragraph after reference 165.

Page 28, the new paragraph beginning IL-15 could easily follow on from the former.

Page 29, line 14, can you add a reference to '... remain undiagnosed.' this is such an important issue to highlight and only really comes up here, at least direct the reader to primary sources.

Regarding Table I cannot see where they are referred to in the text; this may need to be added. Again for brevity I suggest you delete Table 2 and 3.

Figures again for brevity I suggest you delete Figure 2 and 3.
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