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Reviewer's report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Another relevant reference is the Maertens reference in Cancer that outlined a similar study in adult patients (combination therapy with caspofungin)

The details of the patients in page 7-8 could be best summarized in a table and therefore not repeated in the text.

The tables show group A and B, but what we need to see is primary vs. salvage therapy as well mentioned in the text, how did those results differ (most are salvag therapy)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

page 8 - it is still not completely clear, all but 7 patients were on salvage combination therapy?

The dose of voriconazole is low for children, but ? OK due to the age of the group (most were teenagers)

How was the "timing of adoption of combination therapy" defined - timing from what point? 7 days after diagnosis

Figure 1b and 1c should be "days" not "years" in the X axis label.

So, underlying disease was the best predictor of outcome?

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

So the incidence of IA was trimodal?

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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