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Reviewer’s report:

• Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The Discussion part is not to the standard as it should be. Previous studies on CAP were mentioned, but the authors did not indicate the frequency of K. pneumoniae (what %) in the current CAP series of 2001-2008, as compared to 34.1% in the period of June 1988 to September 1991. It should be made clear whether or not the two cohorts are compatible, and I suggest the authors comment on whether the case collection from a single hospital can reflect the situation in an endemic area of Taiwan.

2. In two places in the Discussion, this reviewer found it difficult to follow. Please rewrite to clearly present the points.

Page 12. Bottom, “Classic risk factors in this study did not predispose patients to bacteremia K. pneumoniae CAP.” Hard to understand this statement.

Page 15. “This finding suggests that pulmonary infection with K. pneumoniae might carry little risk for distant metastasis even in patients with systemic invasion.” This statement is not very logical.

• Minor Essential Revisions

English writing needs improvement. Here are some examples.

Page 11. There were no significant differences >> there was no significant difference

Page 13. Line 3. “than for other infections” >> than for other clinical manifestations


Page 16. Monitor these patients more closely. “more” can be eliminated.

Level of interest: An article of outstanding merit and interest in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a
statistician.
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