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I do not think that the authors have changed their article substantially to accommodate my comments. It is clear to me that this is a picture of Fournier's gangrene. They are still describing their findings as "localised necrosis secondary to MRSA". They have not managed to prove this assertion in their case beyond reasonable doubt. The link claimed by the authors between a positive culture of MRSA and localised skin necrosis based on the initial culture is not evidence enough to claim a direct causative link. It can be argued that MRSA could not have been the causative agent. MRSA could have been a skin commensal (as many healthy humans carry) and that the anaerobes which were also cultured were the actual causative agents. Their statement that the initial culture did not grow anaerobes is not evidence to a direct link of MRSA with skin necrosis as it is common to find negative cultures when anaerobic bacteria are the infective agents. I cannot accept the authors' assertion that there is a direct causative link in this case between MRSA and localised genital skin necrosis when the picture is clearly of Fournier's gangrene.

I agree with the authors that that clinical medicine is replete with many grey areas. Given this belief by the authors, I am sure that they would agree that they should not create a grey pathological causation link by providing grey evidence to an otherwise clearly identifiable known pathological entity. The evidence to their assertion is questionable and not clear.

In conclusion, this case is Fournier's gangrene unless proven otherwise. The authors should describe the case as such.
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