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Reviewer’s report:

General
This is an interesting, well-performed study.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

The authors should comment on rapid alternative ways of rapidly diagnosing bacterial meningitis such as the detection of bacterial 16s ribosomal RNA by PCR or published algorithms of clinical and CSF findings (e.g., Nigrovič et al, JAMA 2007; 297: 52-60. Moreover they should discuss that the sensitivity of calorimetry probably is lowe than that of culture.

"Conclusions", line 5: It probably must read "where" instead of "were".

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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.
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