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The paper is a case series of a relatively uncommon group of patients with pneumonia from non-type 1 legionella which likely is not identified in usual clinical practice. While uncommon, the case series is worthwhile in describing the associated syndrome. As in most publications, the pathogen is not identifiable by clinical characteristics–the clinical pattern depends as much on the host as on the pathogen. I think the paper is also worthwhile to argue that the 6 point score is not useful in this group of patients. The findings are not uncommon in populations of patients with pneumonia. I think the conclusions are worthwhile. I have no major suggestions for the authors - well written. Tables are detailed and some could be put into an appendix for a print journal, but for an e-journal they are probably fine.
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