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Reviewer's report:

I thank the editors for the opportunity to review this highly interesting manuscript. I think it is a relevant addition in the summarising of the academic literature on pneumonia.

I have a few concerns and general comments that I think could be of value to the manuscript.

1. While the topic is very interesting the manuscript fails to focus on the most important aspect of the researchers' findings and instead resorts to reporting the data as an excessive list of RxC tables. This results in very long sections (results, discussion, and conclusions) and leads to a cumbersome manuscript that leaves the reader bewildered to what the manuscript actually wants to communicate. Instead the manuscript should focus on the most important/interesting aspect of the research and leave the many other angles to appendices.

2. It would be interesting with a measure of some of the many biases in academic publication. While publication bias is not possible in this case it may be possible to look at difference in publication in prestigious journals (defined in some way) e.g. according to geographical location/collaboration vs non-collaboration or in number of citations e.g. by prestige of journal. I realise this may actually already be included in the manuscript, however, after reading through the manuscript a number of times, I do still not have an overview of what is and what is not reported.

3. The relative change measure does not seem to have any advantage in this study over an easier interpretable absolute change or ratio between the two? Alternatively the relative change could be given in percentage to allow more intuitive interpretation.

4. It may be of interest in the discussion that major actors in LMIC research such as Bill & Melinda gates foundation are known to be biased toward research done by researchers from HIC (doing research in LMIC) see e.g. McCoy D, et al., The Lancet, 2009.

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

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review? If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English
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