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Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions.

Some minor corrections to grammar and spelling are suggested:

Background.
Page 3, line 5. Grammar: “…pay our attention…” should read “…pay close attention…” or otherwise delete “our.”
Page 3, line 13. Insert “a” to read “…admitted earlier to a hospital…”

Methods.
Have you established [in other studies] that such IgM titers rarely occur in your non-patient population, i.e., normal people living in the endemic area? Yours is a hyperendemic region for this disease.
Page 4, line 4. “increased four-fold or more…” [This is the generally accepted way of stating increases in titer].
Page 4, line 5. “Severe scrub typhus ‘was’ defined…”
Page 4, line 14. “At presentation, ‘a’ thorough history ‘was taken’…”

Results and Discussion.
Page 5, line 9. “Severe scrub typhus ‘was’ observed…”
How large was your primary cohort, from which you selected the scrub typhus patients for your study, i.e., what percent of presenting patients were diagnosed with scrub typhus during that time period?
Page 7, line 6. “An eschar could be…frequently ‘in’ reports…
Page 7, line 13. 90% of our patients had ‘an’ eschar…”

Conclusions.
Page 8, line 9. “…when ‘the’ scrub typhus patient was old age, or presented with…” Delete “were”. The phrase “old age” is relative and imprecise. Suggest you insert “older” patient for “old age” (> or = 60?) (including the abstract) and an age breakpoint.[This reviewer is 62 years old and does not consider himself "old."

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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