Reviewer's report

Title: Effectiveness of azithromycin in aspiration pneumonia: a prospective cohort study

Version: 1 Date: 16 September 2014

Reviewer: Yoshitomo Morinaga

Reviewer's report:

Major points

1. Although I’m afraid I poorly understand the study, the study seems to be a case-control (observational) study. If so, the study requires more considerations about some biases including selection bias although the concern is partly described in discussion. Even if the cohort study, I wonder if the physicians’ decision can be strongly-affected by getting participation information. Did the authors blind the subjective person in any way? Anyway, the authors should describe more details about study protocols. For instance, when the patients were included in this study? /who decided the treatment strategy? /the drug selection was decided by physicians? ...

2. Macrolide antibiotics have potent activities against atypical pathogens including Chlamydomphila. How about possible involvements of atypical pathogens? In addition, were anaerobic cultures performed?

3. In table 1, MRSA and P. aeruginosa are listed as pathogens. These are causative bacteria or colonization?

Minor points

1. PSI score can also serve for understanding of readers. Do the authors have data?
2. Table 1 H. influenza -> H. influenzae
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