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Reviewer's report:

Kleinkauf et al. report on the epidemiology of CRO in 2012/13 from the Frankfurt/Main area after the introduction of obligatory reporting.

As currently there is little data on the prevalence of CRO in Germany, the subject of the article is of interest and falls into the scope of the journal.

Major Compulsory Revisions
- The article is well written but would profit from shortening of the text and tables/figures in order to make it more concise (especially methods section and discussion).
- The reference list should also be considerably shortened and should only include articles that are related to the findings of this article. Most references relate to NDM, even though only 4 NDM positive isolates were reported in this study and NDM is by far not the dominating carbapenemase in Germany. The number of references in German language should also be minimized as they are not universally understood by most readers of the journal; some references do not contain any relevant data on CRO (e.g. ref. 26, 27) and could be omitted without compromising the content of the article.

Minor Essential Revisions
- The figure 1 is difficult to read; it could be improved by choosing a different format (e.g. bar or line diagram with the month of the study on the x-axis) and colors which can be more easily distinguished.
- There are remarkable differences in the incidence of CROs between the different hospitals (fig. 2) – how can they be explained?
- How does the reported incidence of 0.127 notifications/1000 patient days compare to that of other studies?
- Please discuss the limitations of the study (most likely underreporting in the beginning of the study time, as could be suggested by the numbers of P. aeruginosa in fig. 1).
- Please correct the spelling of A. baumannii throughout the document.
- In the conclusion section, the authors write that Frankfurt is in a critical phase – how is that backed up by the data provided? You might want to rephrase this sentence in order to be clearer.
Discretionary Revisions
- The term "specimen" or “sample” is usually used instead of “clinical materials”; you may want to replace it.
- Results sections, line 160: when referring to pathogens, “colonizer” would be the more appropriate term instead of “colonisations”.
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