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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions – none

Minor Compulsory Revisions

Introduction
Pag.3 line 2 – dot has to be after brackets, like [1-14].
Pag.3, line 6 – need space between children and citation [15]
Pag.3, line 7 – dot after bracket, like [16].
Pag. 3, line 13, comma after brackets, like [1, 4, 9],
Pag.3, line 14 – I would suggest “the sensitivity” instead of “the efficacy”. This is the parameter which the authors are dealing with.

Materials and methods
Pag.3
- the authors should explain which type of hematological disorders have the patients recruited into study
- how was assessed the temperature? Axillary, oraly, auricular?
pag.4 collection and storage of material
- did the patients receive antiviral therapy before collection of nasal swabs or nasopharyngeal aspirate?
- Did the patients receive any antibiotics before collection of nasal swabs or nasopharyngeal aspirate?
- The authors should explain how many collections were made in the first 24 hours, in the 24-48 hours, and 48-72 hours interval from onset of fever?
- I would suggest that authors explain the interval of time of collection of swabs/aspirates from admittance
- Pag.4, line 16 – dot should be after brackets, like “described [10].”
Pag.5, line 9 – dot after brackets, like [17].
Pag.5 – how was collected 98 paired samples from 89 patients? I suppose some patients had at least 2 collections. What was the reason for additional
collections?
Pag.5, line 19 – dot should be after bracket, like [17].
Pag.6 – I would suggest the authors could clarify or rewritten the first 6 lines. For readers which don’t have solid statistical background could be difficult to understand.
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