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Reviewer's report:
I reviewed the manuscript entitled "Increasing Nontuberculous Mycobacteria Report Rates and Species Diversity Identified in Laboratory Reports" written by Maura J. Donohue. I think the purpose of this study is unclear and I don't think that this manuscript is worthy to publish in the BMC Infectious Diseases.

Firstly, the author described that the aim of this study was "to determine if these trends by species were mirrored in human infections, …". I expected that the author compared the frequency of NTM isolation by species between potable tap water and human samples, however, I cannot find any results in terms of this point in the result section. Thus, I think the hypothesis and results do not link at all.

The most weak point of this manuscript is the lack of clinical information. Since NTMs are ubiquitous bacteria, isolation of NTMs from human specimens does not always mean infection. The author should not use "NTM illnesses (line 219)" and "The species of NTM causing most infections (line 231)" because the data from four states contains contamination. Additionally, the data is not distinguished by the organs of sample collection. Since isolation of NTMs from respiratory, skin, and other organs was mixed up in the data, the focus of study seems unclear.

where samples were collected.
organ of the sample collection data used in this study does not have contains samples author did not distinguish the mix-up data by organ sused in this study was mixed up and does not distinguished by organs

**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.
No

**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.
I recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Needs some language corrections before being published
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