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Reviewer's report:

Background: The author made an inaccurate statement (EV meningitis is confirmed by the presence of pleocytosis in cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) and detection of the virus by reverse-transcriptase polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) or culture. Different results were reported re: pleocytosis in EV meningitis (Reference?)

Methods:
1. Lab confirmation of EV meningitis should include: positive CSF EV polymerase chain reaction (PCR) and negative blood and CSF bacterial cultures
2. There should be a comparison group to compare the EV meningitis vs Non EV meningitis to identify different clinical and CSF chemistry markers to diagnose EV meningitis
3. Need to calculate the sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), and negative predictive value of CSF pleocytosis and different selected markers in relation to the EV RT-PCR result
   Or compare each selected marker in EV vs Non-EV meningitis, then develop a logistic regression model to help diagnosis of EV meningitis if RT-PCR is unavailable.
4. What is the aim of comparing symptoms of patients with pleocytosis to those without pleocytosis, then patients with apleocytosis to those with no apleocytosis, how can this help in diagnosis of EV meningitis.
5. What is pleocytosis seasonality in EV meningitis patients? and how this is used or interpreted?

Discussion: to discuss the cause of apleocytosis in EM meningitis is out of study focus, need to discuss how to expect EV meningitis using different markers in absence of RT-PCR testing results.

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.
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Quality of written English
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