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Sang-Won Park et al compared the clinical presentations of severe fever with thrombocytopenia syndrome (SFTS) with scrub typhus. Based on the comparison, they developed a clinical diagnostic predication model.

The patients of scrub typhus collected during 2009-2011, whereas the cases of SFTS collected from 2013 to 2015. Then, how was the comparability? And how to keep same of the test standard?

As the authors mentioned in their manuscript, Escher was a very typical clinical presentation for scrub typhus. Hence, Escher-positive patient was not necessary to be differentiated with SFTS. Suggest to compare SFTS with only eschar-negative scrub typhus.

According to the authors 'description, the incidence of season and geographic distribution were two vital factors in distinguishing SFTS from scrub typhus. In addition, the history of insect bite and contact with similar cases before illness onset were also important. One reason was that the two diseases had completely different vectors. The other reason was that SFTS virus can transmitted via contact blood or bloody secretion. However, the finial scoring tool only included three laboratory parameters. That was not enough.
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