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Reviewer's report:

I have reviewed the manuscript, “Pediatricians’ Perspectives on the Impact of MRSA in Primary Care: A Qualitative Study” by Hirsch et al.

General comments

1. In general the manuscript is extremely well organized and the background, setting, methods, and results are well described.

2. The authors performed a qualitative study of pediatricians experience and attitudes about diagnosis, management, and prevention of CA-MRSA infections. They accomplished this by conducting 3 focus groups in the San Francisco area, a locale where CA-MRSA is endemic.

3. The study is novel and to my knowledge there are no similar studies in the literature that have used qualitative methods to describe practitioners care of CA-MRSA infections. This investigation is a significant contribution to the literature and the findings will be important for policy development.

4. The qualitative methods are very sound and very well described.

5. In general, a very well done, novel, albeit limited investigation. The limitations include the single locale of the focus groups, which may not be representative of other parts of the U.S. or world. The number of focus groups (3) and clinicians surveyed (29) is another modest limitation. That said, the authors recognized and acknowledged their limitations.

Minor essential revisions

1. On page 6 (methods), the authors state “The question guide was based on a conceptual model using insight from a prior study about how patients with SSTIs present to office settings and how they are managed”. However, the reference given (reference 4) does not have an explicit explanation of this conceptual model. I suggest that the wording of this sentence be changed b/c the reference and statement is misleading. The conceptual model, which is alluded to in the next sentence, should be more clearly stated. It should be acknowledged that the conceptual model was developed for this study (if not, then how it was developed should be explained).
2. On page 15, the authors state “Our participants did not cite reimbursement as a barrier to performing I&D, however, it is possible that this is an important factor as has been shown previously.” This is a very speculative statement about their research subjects given their subjects never mentioned reimbursement but presumably had opportunities to discuss this barrier. The sentence is probably better worded as “Our participants did not cite reimbursement as a barrier to performing I&D, however, reimbursement has been shown previously to be a barrier to I&D.

3. The authors should consider adding a table or figure of the conceptual model, if used, that was the basis of the focus group guide.

**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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