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Reviewer's report:

This is a retrospective single center analysis about cases of respiratory infections caused by SAG, with interesting data about an uncommon etiologic agent.

Mayor revision

1- You should be more clear in the description of the methods, mainly in the statistical and microbiological evaluation.

2- You need to improve the grammar and spelling. Many mistakes were found.

3- Why did you exclude 79 patients with positive culture to SAG? You should be more explicit with inclusion and exclusion criteria.

4- You included six patients with mixed infections, you should excluded the patients with common pathogens for respiratory infections such as H influenzae, E coli, K pneumoniae or at least make a separately analysis.

5- You should describe more clinical outcomes such as mortality, UCI admission, etc. What is “Improvement by treatment”?

6- Why most of the patients received carbapenem?

You should make greater efforts to improve this paper.

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.

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

No

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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