Reviewer’s report

Title: What potential could there be for a S. aureus vaccine in a hospital setting on top of other preventative measures? A model-based analysis.

Version: 3 Date: 4 December 2013

Reviewer: Radboud Duintjer Tebbens

Reviewer’s report:

Discretionary Revisions

I am generally satisfied with the way the authors addressed my comments. Their addition of a clear statement of objectives, the more complete description of the methods and results, and more comprehensive discussion of the limitations significantly improved the manuscript. With respect to my original comment 3, I think it would be helpful if the authors include an explicit reference to the appropriate results in the D’Agata paper (probably Figure 2) to support their statement that the transient dynamics are short-lived and therefore of little interest. With respect to my comment 8c, my view is that it takes more effort from the reader to interpret the meaning of the collection of figures when the y-axis scales change, although I understand that the authors should ultimately decide how to present their results as long as the text helps the reader appreciate the key messages from the figures.
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