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Reviewer's report:

General
The authors have largely addressed the concerns. I note some grammatical issues:

1. Abstract conclusions section-bacteraemia should be bacteraemic
2. Methods, end of 1st paragraph should read '93 years'
3. Results para 2 last two lines should read....'....S. aureus was a common pathogen in nosocomial infection: 39% of ...
4. results page 7 smoking section first line '...patients was higher....'
5. results page 7 last paragraph has a discrepancy over 35.5 and 25.5

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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)

It is not clear how many positive results there were-ie. it would be nice to know what percentage of all positives became part of the study.

I am unclear why diabetes was not considered for possible confounding

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

I would delete table 5 and move the results of that table to text

What next?: Accept after discretionary revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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