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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript describes the molecular epidemiology of B. pseudomallei from clinical specimens obtained from patients in Kelantan state of Malaysia using MLST. Although new ST types were found and submitted to the databases, the authors did not find any novel information compared to those had been reported earlier except it was done in Malaysia that have never been performed before. To make the information more impact and value for the readers, following comments should be added.

1. The authors should compared those STs found with other regions in Southeast Asia and other countries instead of compare only in 83 isolates and gave some limited information.

2. If authors can compare STs with environmental isolates to find out the source of infections, it will be novel and useful. As MLST has been used for long time with B. pseudomallei and the result found in this paper is similar to those found before. The MLST is not useful for finding the bacterial strains and clinical correlation but it is useful for relapse or recurrent infection. Therefore the finding in this paper is not novel.

3. The phylogenetic maps shown in this paper is descriptive and it gives no much new information.

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.

Unable to assess

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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