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Reviewer’s report:

The manuscript by Greenhill et al is well written and a necessary report for future surveillance after introduction of vaccination.

Methods:

which additional tests were performed in the CSF? Leucocytes? glucose? other? May be these data might be added in a table.

Results:

the authors might want to clarify whether the 1404 patients without bacterial isolate had other laboratory signs of meningitis/infection (like increased white blood cells, or changed glucose index in the CSF.

Not all samples with 2 pathogens were excluded because of contamination. Why? The authors might want to expand on the rather high proportion of probable contaminants and possible pathogens.

The exclusion of probable contaminants and possible pathogens should be clarified in a better way.

Discussion:

The authors present data about meningitis in PNG between 1996 and 2005, the pre-vaccin era. By introducing data and results from later periods the discussion sometimes is a little confusing. May be the manuscript might gain clarity by focusing on the results of the study period.

This also might shorten the manuscript.

The authors might want to explain why no MICs were performed (page 13 line 306)
Page 14 line 331 conducting or conducted?
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