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Reviewer's report:

The paper is well-written and clear. It is also important. It would have been helpful for the referee to insert continuous line numbers throughout the paper.

Major compulsory revisions:
In general, citations should be excellent and correspond to the current state-of-knowledge, for example:
1. P5, line: ref. 3-6: reference 6 is not a good example and there are other and better ones.
2. P5, line 8-10: 'account for ....80%': this is too absolute. Where? when? Definitely, other reports exist with other results (Karah et al., JAC 2011, 66:738-744 and van den Broek et al., JCM 2009, 47, 3593-3599)
3. P5, bottom line-p6, top line: Delete part of the sentence 'as it has been ....... multidrug resistance [16,17]' these citations are biased in an attempt to emphasize the importance of the study (citation 16 is very general with no evidence of this phenomenon on Acinetobacter and citation 17 is on a particular environmental strain not representative for clinical relevant acinetobacters.

Page 16: line 4 from bottom: 'A pittii is ...'. The authors should use the past tense (e.g. was found to be) and state where (type of samples, clinical or not) and when.

Finally,
1. it would have been interesting to assess the diversity of the organisms at the strain level, to know whether for each species the organisms were epidemiologically related or not. A high resolution typing method would have been necessary for that since A nosocomialis strains can be highly similar (clonal species). Perhaps antibiotic susceptibility profiles might be used as an indication of the possible epidemic spread of particular strains. There is then the question as to whether this would affect the conclusions of the study (strain or species effect).
2. The study underscores that species identification can be important. rpoB sequence analysis is very useful for this purpose and this should be mentioned (Gundi et al., 2009)

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

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