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Response to reviewers’ comments

Technical Comments:

1) Availability of data and materials: Please remove the 'Not applicable' from line 2 on this section.

Corrected

2) References are not in journal style.

Corrected

3) Improvements to the English language within your manuscript are required and you should have your manuscript reviewed by someone who is fluent in English. If you would like professional help in revising this manuscript, you can use any reputable English language editing service. We can recommend our affiliates Nature Research Editing Service (%CUSTOM_NATURE_EDITING_SERVICE_URL%) and American Journal Experts (%CUSTOM_AMERICAN_JOURNAL_EXP_URL%) for help with English usage. Please note that use of an editing service is neither a requirement nor a guarantee of publication. Free assistance is available from our English language tutorial (%CUSTOM_SPRINGER_ENG_LANG_TUTORIAL_URL%) and our Writing resources
(CUSTOM_BMC_WRITING_RESOURCES_URL). These cover common mistakes that occur when writing in English.

Assistance from a native English speaker obtained and manuscript revised

4) Supplementary material: it is not necessary to upload these with the revised version.

Removed

Editor Comments:

BMC Rheumatology operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Reviewer reports:

Roberto Giacomelli (Reviewer 1):

No further comment to be addressed!

Philippe Guilpain, MD, PhD (Reviewer 2):

The authors improved the manuscript substantially: the three main hypothèses are more clearly indicated as well as the difficult diagnosis procedure.

I suggest that the concept of "confusion" (see the abstract) also appears in the discussion section and conclusion.

No additional comments

Corrected

Conclusion section page 8 line 12-13

“Sero logical tests should be used cautiously, considering the confusion caused by false positive results in autoimmune diseases.”