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**Abstract:**

Line 37: correlate with disease? Do you mean correlate with disease severity or disease presentation?

Line 46: MLST phylogenetic tree? Do the author's mean eburst?

Line 52: MLST database map?

**Introduction:**

Line 71: The authors have ignored a key publication in this section. There is good evidence that certain B. pseudomallei genes contribute to different clinical presentations between Asia and Australia; in particular, the bimABm gene, which has been strongly associated with neurological melioidosis (Sarovich et al., 2014 PLoS ONE 9(3):e91682).

Line 96: missing reference

Line 107-108: What does "preserve the assumption of independence of observations" mean?

Line 132 to 137: This description should be in figure legends rather than methods

**Methods:** The authors provide little to no description of how the clinical presentations were classified. For example, how was bacteremic vs non-bacteremic cases determined? Was this diagnosed with blood cultures or some other method?

Line 160-161: No mention is made as to when different statistical methods were used. i.e. Why did the authors use Fisher's exact over Pearson's Chi squared?

**Results**

Line 178-184: The information contained in Table 1 and the associated explanation are unnecessary and should be removed. Reporting of the individual STs is sufficient.

The authors report the ST analysis in unnecessary detail.
Line 271: "expressed" should be changed to "identified"

The discussion is overly verbose and should be substantially shortened.

**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 am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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