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The Editor,

BMC Infectious diseases.

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE: RESPONSE TO REVIEWERS COMMENTS

I have responded to the reviewers comments as follows:

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

1. See lines 147-148: were the 2 isolates resistant to erythromycin, tetracycline and levofloxacin resistant to penicillin? If so please state that as well.
   Action: Done

2. I suggest you classify the 3 isolates resistant to oxacillin and susceptible to cefoxitin at Borderline Oxacillin Resistant S. aureus (BORSA) and not MRSA.
   Action: The paragraph has been paraphrased. A reference has been added that shows evidence of treatment failure in a patient with a BORSA isolate. However, BORSA isolates usually have oxacillin MICs between 1-4 ug/mL. In this study, the 3 isolates had MICs greater than 4 ug/mL. For this reason, antibiotic susceptibility guidelines suggest that they be reported as MRSA even the mechanism is not mecA.

3. Please include the results of cefoxitin in table 2 showing antibiotic susceptibility
   Action: Done. See track changes.

4. Change MecA everywhere in the manuscript to mecA (in italics)
   Action: Done. See track changes.

5. State the methods used in lines 189-191
   Action: Done. See track changes.

6. Please check the spacing and correct everywhere in the manuscript
   Action: Done. See track changes.

Regards
Geoffrey Omuse