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This manuscript proposes assay method using the meta-analysis to review the accuracy of LAMP for Mycoplasma pneumonia analysis. The submitted manuscript is interesting, but a couple of points should be clarified before a decision upon publication can be made.

(1) Title is not suitable. Pooled analysis is different from meta-analysis. In the abstract, author mentioned that a meta-analysis was carried out to review the accuracy of LAMP for Mycoplasma pneumonia. In the methods, author mentioned that they used culture or PCR for reference standard to evaluate the quality of studies eligible for meta-analysis.

(2) The sentence at 16th to 23th is grammatically wrong.

(3) Mycoplasma pneumonia in the full text should be italicized (Mycoplasma pneumonia).

(4) Author mentioned that the rate misdiagnosis is decreased, compared with culture and PCR. How did author come to this conclusion?

(5) What are the advantages and disadvantages of LAMP for Mycoplasma pneumonia analysis?

(6) It is not well written and there are many typesetting mistakes in the manuscript. I suggest that the authors need to fully check the total paper.
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.

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 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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