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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Sirs,

Thank you for your positive decision on our work. We have made changes according to your comments and these are described in detail below. We thank you for a constructive and positive review process. If there are any further concerns of question we are more than willing to answer these.

Best regards,

Thomas Hellmark

Editor Comments:

1. It has come to our attention that within your Background and Methods there is significant text overlap with other publications, particularly:


While we understand that you may wish to express some of the same ideas contained in these publications, please be aware that we cannot condone the use of text from previously published work. Please rephrase this section in your own words to avoid direct overlap (please note, we cannot accept direct textual overlap with any previously published works even if the authors of the work are yourselves). Please be informed that we cannot proceed with handling your manuscript before this issue is resolved, and the sections of text in question have been reformulated.

- We have gone through the material and method section and searched for parts that were identical or very similar to the publications above. These parts have been rephrased. The first work was our initial study using a very similar setup with overlap in the patient cohorts but with different focus. This is described in the manuscript. The second reference above is a page with abstract from a ANCA and vasculitis workshop in 2017. We presented some preliminary results from this work at this conference we assume that the parts with overlap is found further down on the page under P2_34 Eosinophils in GPA and MPA. We have run similarity tests and gone through the papers and hope that we have found all places with overlap.

2. Please confirm whether informed consent, written or verbal, was obtained from all participants and clearly state this in your "Ethics and Consent to Participate" section. If verbal, please state the reason and whether the ethics committee approved this procedure. If the need for consent was waived by an ethics committee or is deemed unnecessary according to national regulations, please clearly state this, including the name of the committee or a reference to the relevant legislation.

- All consents were written and this is now included both in the method section and the declarations

3. We note that you have not included a ‘Consent for publication’ section in the Declarations. If identifying images or other personal or clinical details of participants are presented that compromise anonymity, a statement of consent to publish from the patient should be included. This section must be included even if it is not applicable to your manuscript. If consent to publish is not applicable to your manuscript please write ‘Not Applicable’ in this section.

- This declaration was wrongly named “consent”. This is changed to “Consent to publish” and contain the phrase “Not applicable”

4. In the “Funding” section of your declarations, please clarify the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript.

- The role of the funding bodies has been clarified and the following sentence has been added: “All of the funding bodies support the project financially as it was described in the project plan but have not been involved in the design of the study, data collection, analysis of data, interpretation of data or writing the manuscript.”
5. Thank you for providing your response to reviewers. However, at this stage it is not required and so we kindly ask that you remove it from your manuscript.

*At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.*

- A clean manuscript without any notes, colors or field codes is now submitted.

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.