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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
No not well defined, the paper is very broad looking at two overlapping grouprs, those diagnosed with MP serologically and differing patterns of poorly defined CXR changes. Consider two manuscripts.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
Methods are appropriate.

3. Are the data sound?
Data are sound but described poorly in the text and confusing. The variables being tested statistically to give p values are not always carefully described. I do not feel adequately qualified to assess all the statistics

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
The hypothesis and conclusion that MP has some immunopathological commonent is very weak. Some of the statistically significant differences are not clinically meaningful.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
No

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?
The English is a little clumsy in places and could do with minor editorial assistance, otherwise it is fine.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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