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Reviewer's report:

The authors evaluated the usefulness of clinical score in case of MRSA infection.

I have two major comments.

1. Gold standard:

   the authors compared the ABC criteria with gold standard:

   (i) inflammation and clinical signs were apparent at the site where MRSA was detected, (ii) systemic inflammation was apparent (fever, elevation of peripheral white blood cells [WBC] or serum C-reactive protein [CRP]), (iii) inflammation was alleviated upon treatment with MRSA-targeted antimicrobials.

   these criteria is not relevant to be used as a gold standard because following reasons.

   1) many criteria are also included in ABC scores
   2) arbitrary : clinical decision not pathological or microbiological confirmation.
   3) gold standard criteria are more simple and convenient to be used. why another score needed?

2. Design

   1) derivation can be performed from retrospective samples; however, validation usually should be performed in prospective manner.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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