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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript entitled "A snapshot of Pneumonia research activity and collaboration patterns (2001-2015): a global bibliographic analysis" presents findings from a search of WoS publications related to an important infectious disease over a period of 15 years. The authors provide a description of their methods for inclusion of research articles using MESH terms and provide a number of trends across countries. The findings are interesting, and there is a great deal of discussion of the impact of the findings in the manuscript. I have a few minor corrections and some more substantive comments on the content of the manuscript. Of particular interest is the degree to which the authors track international collaboration on research.

Of minor note:

1) The authors use two different systems of citation. The introduction uses the author name and date, while subsequent sections make references to numbered citations.
2) There is a sentence fragment on line 40 of p 1.
3) Line 34 of p 1 has a sentence which is difficult to read. I suggest rewording.
4) The limitation of the review to end in 2015 makes the manuscript almost outdated prior to its publication. If there is some way to include newer publications the authors should attempt to do so.
5) It seems to be logical to not include letters and reviews of books, etc. However proceedings often include original research. The authors should provide some information on why proceedings were excluded from the analysis.

On a more substantive note:

1) There is much to be derived from the analyses, but the authors seem to have mixed results and discussion too much. The long discussion, complete with citations of new references, reads almost like a new literature review. If these items are important, perhaps they should be moved. I would recommend cutting the current "Discussion" section into two subsections: "Results" and "Discussion." Much of what is currently there is not a result of this study, but the authors' long discussion of potential impact of more/less research by certain countries is interspersed with findings.
2) There is perhaps too much use of figures and mapping. It is not helpful to see a heat map of the counties production of research as this is already presented in more detail in the tables. The 6 world maps, the path figures and the trend line graph are all unnecessary. The use of all this obscures the findings rather than clarifies them.
3) The discussion section goes far beyond the results of the research. If the authors wish to make some of these statements on the impact perhaps the focus of the article should be changed.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
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