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The BioMed Central Editorial Team

Thank you for the e-mail and the reviewer’s comments. I have addressed their concerns which are presented below:

Reviewer 1

Major

I have included the reference of N.C. Bodonaik which has become reference # 29. The other references have been re-numbered accordingly.

Minor

1. Pages 3, lines 5 – 8 “HCPs may also be carriers…to eradicate the organism,” have been deleted.
2. Page 11, paragraph 2, lines 2 – 4, have been adjusted to read: “Community MRSA prevalence was observed to increase over the 6 - year study period (4.1% in 1999 to 8.1% in 2004), but this was not statistically significant.”
3. Page 7, line 3. Bracket has been inserted, as directed.
4. Page 8, paragraph 2. Redundant, “…for community strains” at the end of the paragraph, has been deleted, as directed.
5. Page 8, line 1, paragraph 3. The word “isolates” has been inserted after MRSA.
6. Page 9, last sentence. “Table 4 (formerly Table 5)” added at the end of the paragraph.
8. Page 10, paragraph 2. “Acquired” changed to “practice” as directed. Also, “maybe” changed to “may be”
11. Table 3, deleted as suggested by reviewer 2.

Reviewer 2.

Table 1. It is not clear to me what is being asked of me regarding this Table.

Table 2. Reviewer 2 indicated that this table should be a table on MSSA. It is a table of MSSA. On the part that “98.6% of MSSA are sensitive to ampicillin and 24.4% resistant to augmentin…” This is what was observed from the laboratory record books. Among community MSSA the 68.2% and 70% resistance to ampicillin and augmentin, respectively, were typographical errors, and so adjusted.

Table 3 is deleted, and the appropriate adjustments made in the results section. Statistical analysis of data mentioned on page 7, last sentence.

Table 4 (formerly Table 5) is now mentioned on page 9.

Page 11…..Reviewer’s 2 concerns were addressed on page11, paragraph 2, lines 2 - 4.

The Discussion regarding hospital guidelines…This was hospital guidelines as there are no national guidelines from which to draw reference.

Regarding MRSA data from other Caribbean countries…As mentioned on page 10, lines 9-10, data are scanty. However, I am grateful to both reviewers for their suggested references.

I trust that I have adequately responded to the concerns of the 2 reviewers.

Sincerely yours

Fitzroy A. Orrett