Reviewer's report

Title: Burden of severe RSV disease among immunocompromised children and adults: a 10 year

retrospective study.

Version: 0 Date: 15 Sep 2017

Reviewer: Chantel Sloan

Reviewer's report:

This study is well done, and I think offers an interesting perspective on hospitalization due to

RSV. There are some points that need clarification, as I've indicated below.

1. As an editorial point, I am not sure why the abstract is written as sentence fragments rather

than full sentences. Please revise.

2. Pg 1. Line 8: "elderly" should be replaced with "persons over 65 years old", if that is the

intended meaning.

3. There is some further editing for grammar that is needed. For example, on pg 1. line 41 the

phrase "RSV infection could participate to CLAD" is unclear.

4. Please provide more information on how persons were determined to have included as

having the different conditions listed. Were there criteria around what to do if a chart was

unclear?

5. Please list the relevant baseline characteristics described on page 5, line 3.

6. It is difficult to determine the appropriateness of the multivariate logistic model, because it is

not described. Are all the covariates used listed in the tables? I also did not fully understand

how age in 10 year increments was incorporated in the model, but in the table it is divided

as child/adult.

7. Do you expect that varying levels of error rates with rapid testing/PCR impacted your outcomes? Why or why not?

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.

Yes

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

Declaration of competing interests

Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

- 1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
- 2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
- 3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?
- 4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

- 5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?
- 6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

'I declare that I have no competing interests.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal