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**Reviewer’s report:**

Minor essential revisions:

1. Several examples of using complete name after defining abbreviations and through text. (Eg. Discussion, para 1 sentence 1: staphylococcus aureus bacteremia is used after defining SAB in the Introduction, community- associated MRSA is used after defining cMRSA). I found this confusing.

2. Results: Page 6, para 1 - 765 episodes were excluded because postcodes were incomplete. Did the authors determine whether Indigenous persons were over-represented in these exclusions. There were only 536 Indigenous episodes overall.

3. Results: Page 8, para 1 - Recommend evaluating sentence structure to make this section more readable. The paragraph is choppy and. Eg. “This revealed that ethnicity was not an independent predictor of mortality, including in a model that included age and ethnicity only”

4. Discussion: page 9, para 2 - minor grammmatical errors - sentence 1 - focussed should be “focused”; last sentence – should add “year” to “by the age of one”

5. Discussion: page 9, para 3, sentence 1 – The authors need to clarify what population is being discussed - Is this talking about Indigenous people?

6. Discussion: page 9-10 para 3 – The authors need to clarify this sentence. Are the authors suggesting that cMRSA across Australia is emerging from Indigenous populations, or that cMRSA is emerging within Indigenous populations. Please clarify.

7. Discussion: page 10, para 1 – Again, it is unclear whether the authors are referring to the overall population, or only Indigenous populations in their referral to initiatives “In the meantime, there is emerging evidence to suggest that regional community health provider based initiatives can be successful in reducing scabies and skin infections.

8. Conclusion: is lengthy – recommend shortening it to 2-3 sentences and removing review of literature

9. Methods: I found it confusing to read the Methods after the Conclusions.

10. Methods: page 15 – The authors do not define the Index (1 through 5) of Relative Socio-economic Advantage and Disadvantage increases or decreases with increased socioeconomic status.
11. Table 1: The formatting of columns in the heading does not translate well. The authors use several abbreviations – which must be referenced in the footnotes

12. Figure 3. Title: “incident” should be “incidence”

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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