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Reviewer’s report
Minor revision

My comments

1. Methods, third paragraph
“A case Fusobacterium bacteremia ….” should be corrected to “A case of Fusobacterium bacteremia…..

2. Methods, third paragraph
Authors emphasized that they exclude repeated cases within 365 days to prevent duplicate counting and there were no cases where one individual over the entire 11-year study period had had another episode of bacteremia.

So, I suggest the authors to read the following two articles, which may give you some different ideas to express your definition much rationally. These articles are:
Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy 2008, 62; 1138-41

In these 2 articles, they all emphasized the same point as yours: no duplicated cases were included during the study period.

The 365-day interval is an arbitrary definition, which may cause many debates or
challenges. For example, a male patient with biliary tree stones has had two episodes of K. pneumonia bacteremia within one year, but the interval between these 2 episodes was 6 months. Obviously, the residual stones were the predisposing factors, but who can say that these 2 episodes were the same episode. They might be 2 different episodes. I think the debate will happen in your case definition.

You may follow above 2 published articles and modify your definition if you agree with their methods. If not, you can just add a supplementary description behind the sentence: repeated isolation…….to prevent biasing of incidence rates. The supplement will be as follows: there were no cases where one individual over the entire 11-year study period had had another episode of bacteremia.

3. Methods, fourth paragraph – The definition of nosocomial bacteremia?

Infections are considered hospital-acquired if they first appear 48 hours or more after hospital admission or within 30 days after discharge. The authors still insisted to use “within 48 hours of hospital discharge”, maybe the authors can explain more, such as no case happened after 48 hours of discharge.

4. Results, first paragraph

I suggest the authors to give a supplementary description for the 10 patients without hospitalization in the text. Most of the papers talking about the analysis of bacteremia caused by a specific pathogen excluded the outpatients to avoid some possible bias. If the authors still wish to put these 10 patients in your analysis, you had better tell the readers what kind of information could be obtained from these cases, for examples, sex, age, underlying diseases, or just the species of fusobacteria etc..

In Table 4, how many patients were enrolled in risk factor analysis, 62 or 72 cases? As the authors said that only 62 patients can have further clinical information, I wish to understand how many patients were counted in this analysis for risk factors.

5. Results, first paragraph

There is a typing error at the last 2nd line: indentified? I think it should be the word – identified.

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.

Declaration of competing interests:

No any competing interest!