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Reviewer's report:

This is a systematic review about epidemiology and etiology of ARI in children and about its associated prognostic factors. The focus of this article is interesting; the search is systematic and includes data from published and unpublished literature.

However, I have some minor changes to recommend in order to improve this article:

Abstract:
• The reviewer suggests modifying slightly the wording of the purpose of the work to include the word “systematic” in the abstract.
• The reviewer also suggests adding information about the study selection in the methods part.

Methods:
• It could be interesting to have more information about studies inclusion criteria. Which types of studies were included? Was there an age limit for the research? etc.
• Were the two readers involved in both phases of identification and screening? How were the discordances between the two readers resolved?
• The reviewer is perplexed about figure 1. It appears that all studies identified in phase 1 (based on keywords of the search strategy) seemed pertinent for the research. Wasn’t there any false positive in the search? How could the authors find only relevant records without limit on age of the participants?
• 1 full text was not found. Did the authors try to contact the authors of this text to get the full text? Authors should give information about that in the methods part.
• What is the rationale for including studies conducted in the past 17 years?

Results:
• It could be interesting to have some information about the characteristics of the studies included in this systematic review; what type of studies did the authors used, what were the clinical characteristics of subjects, what was the age range, the sex ratio etc. ?
• The reviewer suggests giving details about the number of studies
involved/concerned in each paragraph of the “results/discussion” part. For example, how many, among the 32 studies, discussed about the clinical management.

• Figure 2 is not clear and readers will not be able to differentiate the two age group. Please add a clear legend and choose different types of lines (dotted and plain). Add also a legend for the ordinate.

• Figure 4: authors should add the sign “%” to the data in the legend to indicate that it corresponds to incidence.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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