

Dear editor and reviewer,

I have tried to revise the manuscript reflecting the recommendations of the reviewers as much as possible. The changes in the manuscript ('1 21251-Revised manuscript.docx' file) have been written in red color.

In this answering letter, the comments of the reviewers are presented in italics.

[Reviewer 138749]

Congratulations for this updated review concerning the use of corticosteroids in Kawasaki disease. It is clear and well written. Major points: A recent paper published in Ped Int entitled "Verification of risk scores to predict intravenous immunoglobulin resistance in incomplete Kawasaki disease" by Kanamitsu et al, provides new insights in incomplete KD. Their results may be discussed in this review, particularly in the topic "The use of corticosteroids in patients unresponsive to IVIG treatment" Minor points: Correct ref 43 Review table 3 " β -propiolactonation" (ref 64 & 65) should appear "B-propiolactone" as the IVIG compound involved in different outcomes.

I added a comment about the study result by Kanamitsu et al in section 'The use of corticosteroids in combination with IVIG as the first line treatment in selected patients'. And I added one reference of it to 'References'.

I changed the " β -propiolactonation" to the " β -propiolactone" in Table 3.

[Reviewer 503045]

The whole issue is relevant and touches an important question. However, the whole review is not well focused and requires English improvement. Abstract: Needs to be shorter. Better focused. Borders between the 3 options are not clear. Last paragraph is confused. Introduction: Should explain better what are the exact questions. The given information on all different options is not clear and in many parts is similar to the others. Discussion: Is a repetition to what authors cite and describe in introduction. The whole review should be restyled

The 'Abstract' has been abridged. And I modified the last paragraph in 'Introduction' which would have been the main cause of uncertainty of this manuscript, according to the recommendation by 2nd reviewer.

I have looked over the manuscript, and have tried to make the manuscript be focused and be clear.

Thanks the reviewers for their valuable opinions. Their recommendations were really helpful in this revision of the manuscript.

Yours sincerely,

Jeong Jin Yu