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Thank you for this paper, which is on "emerging serotype III sequence type 17 group B streptococcus invasive infection in infants: the clinical characteristics and impact on outcomes". This is a very useful and well-written addition to an increasing body of literature. The authors have determined the serotype distribution, antimicrobial resistance and molecular characteristics of neonatal invasive GBS isolates from Taiwan, 2003-2017. Please see my comments below:

Introduction:

The authors should mention if routine GBS screening is carried out amongst pregnant women in Taiwan and if so, when was it introduced?

Materials and methods:

Page 5, Line 98: Need to say what CGMH stands for?

Page 6: Line 112: delete "be" in the sentence: Episodes reported by physicians with negative CSF cultures were also be included if CSF results showed…

Results:

Page 8, Line 148: Suggest putting (iGBS) in brackets, after invasive GBS…

Page 9, Line 169: Where the mothers who gave birth to EOD cases screened during their pregnancy? If so, where they identified as GBS positive.
Discussion:

Page 11, Line 209: What does LOS stand for?

Why was there a huge upsurge in serotype III isolates from 2003 to 2013 (Figure 2). Was it because more cases were reported, or was there an increase in serotype III transmission associated with a particular hospital? Have there been attempts to identify the source for those iGBS cases that were LOD or LLOD?

Page 13, Line 237: (DIC)-need to describe these acronyms if they are being mentioned for the first time.

Page 13, Line 238: "However, only type Ib GBS strain often caused meningitis": not sure if this statement is valid, given that the number of these strains are very small in this study.

Page 13, Line 249: The sentence should say: The overall mortality in our cohort was 6.6%.

Limitations:

The authors have mentioned serotyping by molecular methods but no mention of slide agglutination methods. Though molecular techniques are rapid and easy to perform, they don't inform us about the expression of the genes detected.

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 am able to assess the statistics
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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