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Reviewer's report:

This study compares the outcome and types of pathogens in healthcare-associated and community-acquired bloodstream infection. The objective of the study is well defined and the methods are appropriate. The manuscript adheres to the standards for reporting and the data are sound. The list of references adequately represents recent research on the topic and the writing is acceptable, including the abstract and the discussion. The statistical analysis seems to be adequate and reliable.

The first part of the conclusions is clearly supported by the data but in the second part it is not clear how the findings suggest that the criteria for HCA BSI should be reviewed.

Although the title truly represents what was done in the study it may be modified to convey what has been found.

Minor Essential Revisions
Page 4 line 62: Suggesting "comprise" instead of "increase".
Page 5 line 97: ref # should be 16 not 15.
Page 8 line 162: Suggesting "pathogens" instead of "aetiologies".
Page 8 line 171: "in community" is redundant.
Page 9 line 190: 28% vs. 28% cannot produce a p value of 0.1.
Page 11 line 222: Only ref 7 included patients who were not hospitalized. Refs 5 & 9 included hospitalized patients only.
Page 11 lines 223-4: The meaning of this sentence is not clear.
Page 12 line 249: Was MDR explained anywhere earlier in the text?
Page 12 line 257-9: Suggesting remodeling this sentence as follows: All three variables are known risk factors for certain types of pathogens or resistances that are not typical for strict community pathogens, and they should be taken into account when considering empirical therapy.
Page 12 line 261: Suggesting: similar to previous studies dealing with an outcome impact of HCA BSI. The findings would not be

Table 1. It is not clear what does "Data from reference 10" mean. If this study population is based on a cohort that was included in a previous study it should be clearly stated in the "patient selection" section, and preferably also in the
ABSTRACT.

It is suggested that the total number of patients in each column be added to the table and it should be stated that the numbers in parenthesis are percents. "R" and "MDR" explanations in the footnote are redundant since they are not mentioned in the table.

Table 2. The numbers in 2 cells are distorted, line: "Severity of SIRS", column: "dead at day 30".

The term "CNS" is misleading since it may be considered "central nervous system" (especially when appearing immediately after "Source of bacteremia" category. It should be changed to "CONS", which is a more accepted term.

Table 4. Line "Klebsiella spp." Third column "K" should be replaced by "N". Wherever "#-lactam/#-lactam inhibitor" is mentioned it should say "#-lactam/#-lactamase inhibitors".

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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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