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Reviewer's report:

This is a prospective cohort study about community-acquired pneumonia (CAP) in children with Mycoplasma pneumoniae (Mp) detection that compares the clinical and laboratory features of cases with or without viral and/or bacterial co-detection.

There are many previous studies that investigated viral and/or bacterial co-detection in children with Mp infection. The study struggles with the known problem about what is detection (carriage/colonization) and infection. Mp-positive cases included also (i) Mp-DNA-BALF-negative cases (these may be the true negative ones) and (ii) Mp-DNA-NPA-positive as well as Mp-IgM-positive cases (which can also represent Mp carriage, see also Pediatr Infect Dis J. 2018 Nov;37(11):1192-1195). In contrast to RSV, the role of HRV detected in URT samples among CAP patients is controversial. Further, bacterial co-detection in respiratory samples in this study represents in most cases colonization and/or contamination (considering the detected bacterial species). Given all these shortcomings and the low numbers of cases within each group it makes it very difficult to compare the data presented in Table 3-5. The study would benefit from more stringent diagnostic criteria, e.g. Mp-positive = Mp-DNA-BALF-positive and compare within this group those with no co-detection vs. viral co-detection (URT samples, with and without HRV) vs. bacterial co-detection (blood culture only).

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