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Reviewer's report:

Editor's Comments

Major Revisions:

Data should not be duplicated in the text after it has been presented in Tables. The result should only be analyzed in the text if already presented in Tables. As an alternative, the tables could be deleted and the data only described in the text, but I prefer to see that data in the tables. Therefore all references of data in the text (that has already been presented in tables) should be deleted. This refers to the data in the text following all Tables 1-5. Data should never be duplicated in the text and in tables and/or figures.

Delete Figure 2. This figure is incorrect as pie charts only have 100%. This data is described in the text.

After all descriptions of statistical analyses and statement of P values, include the statistical test used to determine the analysis, such as Chi-square, T-test, etc.

Many references are in incorrect formats. References 1 and 10 are in an incorrect style. There is no journal listed for Reference 1. Furthermore, many of the references list the first and middle names of the authors and the first initial of the last name. This is obviously incorrect. I know this as I am the lead author of Reference 30. These style and author errors must be corrected.

Include page number on the manuscript to aid in review.
Discussion, second page, lines 25-31: It is stated "The data indicated 30.2% of patients were infected in winter, 29.9% in summer, 22.4% in autumn, and 17.5% in spring. Winter and summer was the high risk season of EKC." This statement should be backed up with statistics. These Statistics were not presented in the Results section. Present the statistical analysis for these comparisons in the Results section. Revise the text to read "Winter and summer were the high risk seasons for EKC" if the statistical analysis proves this point. If not, then remove this statement.

Minor Revisions:

Abstract Background, last word should be the plural form "criteria" not the singular form "criterion". This should also be revised in the Discussion.

Test Background, line 42: typo "samlpe" should be revised to read "sample".

Methods, Study Population, second page and other places in the manuscript: the adjective "pseudomembranous" must be revised to the noun "pseudomembranes".

Methods, General Information: Provide the ages of the four groups of patients, children, adolescents, adults, and the aged. These were listed in the results, but this is in text that should be deleted. It is a better approach to define the groups in the Methods.

Results, Clinical signs, third page, line 23: revise "Only one old people" to "Only on aged patient".

Discussion, first page, line 20: revise "adenovirustype" to "adenovirus-type".

Discussion, first page, line 26: the "I" in Involvement is not capitalized. Insert a space between the period and "The" at the beginning of that sentence.
Discussion: Confirm the names used when citing works used in the text are last names. Use only the last names and no initials.

Discussion, second page, line 17: "history" is misspelled. Also "red-eye people" should be "red-eye patients".

Discussion, third page, line 45: revise "an old people" to "an aged person".

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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