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Reviewer's report:

The authors have submitted a revised manuscript for their study comparing the performance of IgM, culture and FQ-PCR for M. pneumoniae diagnosis. I thank the authors for their responses to my comments and I am happy with their modifications to the manuscript.

I have a detailed a few minor comments below regarding content but the main issue is regarding the grammatical errors that remain in the written English, particularly regarding the use of the plural/singular, the use of the past/present tense and the use of articles. I would recommend the authors ensure the manuscript is reviewed for grammar by a native speaker if possible. In its present form it does not flow very well and therefore doesn't currently meet the language standard of other articles in the journal.

Minor essential revisions:
Language - as detailed above

Discretionary revisions:
I suggest the use of intermediate not “mediate”, e.g. line 31, 167

I note the authors have carried out multiple chi-square tests for the data in Table 1; have the authors corrected for multiple testing and if so, can they add this to the statistical analysis section.

I suggest “QIAmp DNA Mini Kit” rather than the catalogue number 51306.

I suggest not putting the virus names in italics

I suggest on line 145 “the two groups had a similar pattern of biochemical and haematological findings” rather than “laboratory examinations”.

I suggest that the sentence on line 174-5 “Based on these findings…” does not really add anything and could be deleted for brevity.

The addition of the JRS scoring system is interesting in the discussion but the actual data could be added to the end of the results section e.g. number of cases with JRS score >=4 etc in the MP and non-MP groups, in order to give the %
sensitivity and specificity referred to in the discussion.

I note that the information regarding the other agents identified in the cohort, as detailed in the author’s response, is not in the manuscript; it could fit in nicely around line 137 in the results section.

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