Reviewer’s report

Title: Yersinia pseudotuberculosis infection in Kawasaki disease and its clinical characteristics

Version: 9 Date: 26 March 2015

Reviewer: Victoria Dimitriades

Reviewer’s report:

Minor Essential Revisions
Conclusions- line is repeated
RAISE study group- First sentence is too long and hard to follow- please revise.

Discretionary Revisions

Background- Please elaborate on which YPT symptoms satisfy clinical criteria for KD

Overall- This paper is quite interesting, very well-written, and shows thoughtfulness in the planning of comparison clinical data. My only real concern was that there are two separate issues being compared: First, the incidence and clinical characteristics of YPT infection in KD patients, and second, efficacy of RAISE vs conventional protocols. There are several parts of the paper which refer only to clinical efficacy between the two in CS, but which don’t seem to fit into a paper about YPT. It is confusing to go back and forth between those two separate issues and I would recommend two separate papers addressing this. However, I do believe the discussion of differences in the protocols IN RELATION TO PATIENTS WITH YPT is very salient to this paper. In Table three, perhaps addressing how many of the high risk patients in each group were also found to have YPT and CS (rather than looking at the total number treated) would also give more information regarding characterization of these patients...

In that same vein, I am not sure that the Figure 1 is very clear as there are many competing variables with your n. Perhaps splitting this figure into two (RAISE vs conventional) would also be helpful.
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