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REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: This is an original report of a unique finding. Positive antibody titer for Burkholderia pseudomallei in a patient presenting with an overall well documented diagnosis of AOSD has never been reported. However, while the diagnosis of AOSD seemed well oriented to me by the clinical presentation, I see a week rationale for testing this patients for melioidosis other than the history of Burkholderia pseudomallei infection in the residential area of the patient. Burkholderia pseudomallei typically presents with pneumonia or skin abscesses, symptoms not referred by the patient. Other than that, the authors performed an extensive diagnostic work-up and achieved a final diagnosis in a timely way. Indeed, AOSD is usually diagnosed with a long delay due to scarce awareness of its clinical manifestations. I do not see ways in which the work of authors did not meet best practice.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

In order to strengthen the relevance of this unusual finding I would: (1) clearly state the country of origin of the patient and her living area. (2) report the frequency of positive antibody titre for Burkholderia pseudomallei in that area (reference this statement); (3) indicate what methodology was used to test the serology for Burkholderia and comment on that in the discussion. Indeed, it is well-known that agglutination, for instance, may generate false positive results; (4) clarify what species of Burkholderia was detected by the antibodies.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

N/A
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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