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Reviewer's report:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic?

Yes

2. Do you have any ethical concerns? Please consider if local Institutional Review Board approval or ethical approval was obtained (if appropriate) and if the patient (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 18) gave written, informed consent to publish this case and any accompanying images. A statement to this effect should appear in the manuscript.

Comments: No ethical concerns.

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?

Yes

4. Does the article report the following information? Where information is missing, please specify.

a. The relevant patient information, including:
   - De-identified demographic information (age, gender, ethnicity)
   - Main symptoms of the patient
   - Medical, family and psychosocial history
   - Relevant past interventions and their outcomes

b. The relevant physical examination findings
c. Important dates and times in this case (if appropriate, organized as a timeline via a figure or table); if specific dates could lead to patient identification, consider including time relevant to initial presentation, i.e. initial presentation at T = 0, follow up at T = 1 month.

d. Diagnostic assessments, including:
   - Diagnostic methods
   - Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural)
   - Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable

e. Types and mechanism of intervention

f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits

Comments: All necessary information were provided by the authors except for the details on treatment and clinical course which I have highlighted in other comments below.

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?

Comments: Partially

6. Is the anonymity of the patient protected? Please consider any identifying information in images such as facial features or nametags, whether the patient is named etc. If not, please detail below.

   Yes

7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?

Comments: Yes.
8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?

Comments: Not sure

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?

The authors report a case of life-threatening bronchiolitis in a 17-months-old boy. This report was evaluated with the aid of the CARE checklist (https://www.care-statement.org/care-checklist.html). I have some major comments.

TITLE: Did the bronchiolitis occur on the same side as the pneumonia? It is difficult to tell. Please, replace "case presentation" with "case report".

ABSTRACT: Reads well.

1. Background: does not reveal the importance of this case to medical literature. The authors only highlighted that the diagnosis of Bocavirus 1 is challenging which is not new to medical literature.

2. Case presentation: Can the authors states the symptoms the patient presented with instead of saying "typical symptoms"?

3. Conclusion: It is neither novel nor coherent with the impression that the authors stated in the last sentence of the Background: "...diagnostics of acute HBoV1 respiratory tract infection is challenging".
MAIN TEXT

1. Background: Please, see my comments on the Background of the abstract.

2. Case presentation:

(a) P6/L7 - 8: The kind gesture of professor Hsin-Fu Liu can be moved from the main text to the acknowledgement section.

(b) The authors can abridge the diagnostic assessment. I found it, a little bit too lengthy.

(c) Line 135: If there was no evidence of a bacteria infection, why did the authors place the patient on antibiotics therapy with Ceftriaxone?

(d) Line 135: Can the authors state the dose, frequency and duration of ceftriaxone, methylprednisolone and Oseltamivir that was administered.

(e) Line 136: "Oseltamivir was cancelled after three days...". Rather say Oseltamivir was *discontinued* after three days

(f) Line 141: 46 days of hospitalisation is too long for treatment of bronchiolitis. It will the informative if the authors can brief the reader on any significant event between day 6 and 46 of hospitalisation. Or at least, justified why the patient needed to be hospitalised for this long.

I will suggest the authors focus on bringing out the novelty of their case.
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