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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have done a great job reporting the prevalence of CAP and its burden in the European nation. They however have sufficed to descriptive data; it would have been a better idea if they had added some analytical data as well, compared the results between countries and provided p-values. Adding some graphs to the article would also ease the understanding of some sections.

The authors should also add an abbreviation list. They have mentioned cSSTI in the methods section but never explained or used it elsewhere. Similarly, they have used HCAP in the results, without providing the readers with what it stands for.

Some data need not be reported in the article. For instance, it is obvious that immunosuppressed patients are more likely to be isolated or patients in septic shock may need for blood pressure support and ....

In line 199, the authors have mentioned "particularly frequently." I believe the authors rewrite the phrase.

The authors have mentioned that the study aims to assess the economic burden of CAP in the European nation. This comes that there is no data on the direct or indirect cost of CAP-related issues in the results section. More focus should be shifted toward economic issues of CAP considering the objectives of the study. Moreover, the third paragraph in the discussion section which reports some economic costs should have a backing in the results.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.