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Reviewer’s report:

There are several issues which have to be improved in the manuscript:

1. Manuscript is written in colloquial form. Writing style should be improved.

2. Lack of diagnostic methodology. There is no information about methods used and pathogens searched for (except HAdV and H. influenzae). In particular:
   - what method was used for HAdV DNA detection (regular or real-time PCR, in-house or commercially available, producer)?
   - If BAL samples were tested with qualitative or quantitative PCR method for HAdV?
   - What was exact methodology of mycological laboratory diagnostics?
   - Was there testing for respiratory viruses other than HAdV?
   - How was adenovirus type determined?

3. Conclusions presented by the Authors indicate the need for sequential diagnosis (first - detection of the virus the material corresponding with localized infection and then - blood testing). In such situations, however, today's consensus indicates detection of the virus in both materials at the same time, and in many clinical settings this approach is already routine for symptomatic patients from risk groups. Conclusions should be improved.

Please, find manuscript file with comments.

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.
Unable to assess

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

No

**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:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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