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Author’s response to reviews:

1st December 2017

Dr. Philippa Harris
Editor-in-Chief
BMC Infectious Diseases

Ref.: Ms. No. INFD-D-16-01080-R3

Title: Available, Bed-sided, Comprehensive (ABC) Score to A Diagnosis of Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus aureus Infection: A Derivation and Validation Study
Authors: Nori Yoshioka, et al.
Dear Dr. Harris:

Thank you for your careful review and constructive comments on our manuscript. In accordance with the reviewers’ recommendations, we have revised and added discussion to the manuscript. RED indicates modified portions.

We are grateful to you for allowing us to submit our revised manuscript. We hope that this revised manuscript is acceptable for publication in your esteemed journal.

Sincerely yours,

Nori Yoshioka

Corresponding author

Division of Infection Control and Prevention
Osaka University Hospital
2-15 Yamadaoka, Suita, Osaka 565-0871, Japan

Phone number: +81-6-6879-5093
Fax number: +81-6-6879-5094
E-mail: yoshioka@hp-infect.med.osaka-u.ac.jp

Editor Comments:
Comment #1

Under the Authors' Contributions section, please use the authors' initials and not their full names. As two of the authors have the same initials (Nori Yoshioka and Norihisa Yamamoto), please use a middle initial (if possible) to differentiate between the two of them.

Answer #1

We have used the authors’ initials in the contributions section.

For those two with the same initial, they were expressed differently as “NY (Yoshioka)” and “NY (Yamamoto)”

Comment #2

On uploading your revisions, please remove any highlighting, and include a single, clean copy of the manuscript.

Answer #2

As instructed, we surely upload only a clean copy of the manuscript.

Reviewer reports:

Shey-Ying Chen (Reviewer 3): The manuscript now is more appropriate for publication in current status. I have only one comment and on phrasing suggestion.

Comment #1.

First, since subgroup analysis was not performed for sterile samples (n = 6) in the validation phase, the sentence of "In case of the sterile samples, even though the samples were few in number (n = 6), results of clinical diagnosis and the ABC score were perfectly consistent" (Line 243-244) is overstatement and should be deleted. So I would like to suggest revising the sentence
as "The subgroup analysis for non-sterile (Group 0-2) samples in validation phase demonstrated a consistently high utility of the scoring system (AUC, 0.978; 95% CI, 0.955-1.0; sensitivity, 92.9%; specificity, 93.3%). For the sterile samples (Group 3) in the validation phase, subgroup analysis was not performed due to the small case number (n = 6)."

Answer #1.
Thank you for your recommendation. The sentences were rewritten as indicated (Line 240-244).

Comment #2.
Second, in Background section, Line 71-74, initial description" "A multi-centered retrospective cohort study led to the development of a simple risk score to identify patients with community-acquired MRSA pneumonia, who might benefit from MRSA therapy [13]. This scoring method could be useful, but is limited to pulmonary infections" is not clear to emphasize the unique goal of this study. I would like to suggest revising this sentence as "Though previous studies proposed various scoring models to stratify the risk of contracting MRSA among patients with pulmonary or bloodstream infections, these scoring models are limited in predicting the presence of MRSA infection rather than differentiating active MRSA infection from colonization status [13, new reference]."

New reference:

Comment #2.
Thank you again for your recommendation.
We have revised the sentences as requested. (Line 71-74)

Thank you for your review.