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Reviewer's report:

This is a retrospective study where I have the impression is that selection of patients was based on microbiological diagnosis and not on clinical presentation. The latter is however suggested. It is unclear how many of the dengue patients were NS1 positive and how many IgM Dengue pos. There is no indication which tests were used although there may be large variation in sensitivity and specificity. Unclear is whether only inpatients were included or also outpatients?? Possibly the patients with bacteria infection were much more sick (all admitted) and recovered much slower compared to Dengue (also out-patients?), possibly contributing to persistent differences in CBC in patients groups

Exclusion criteria were, among others platelets less than 140,000 or more than 40,000: this is very unclear to me as low platelets numbers are a feature of dengue virus infection

Statistics are unclear as an estimated prevalence of 20% was indicated, but of what is not indicated.

Procedures of blood sampling is unclear: first sample at presentation to facility or during admission? Frequency of blood taking was according to physician. How many patients were taken blood only once, or twice??

CBC results are related to days of fever: not described in methods.

The presented clinical and laboratory results (high hematocrit, thrombopenia, leucopenia, atypical lymphocytes, monocytosis etc) in Dengue have been described in literature before.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?

If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No
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.
Yes

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.
I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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