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Reviewer's report:

Overall I thought the manuscript was well written. In the abstract and results section the authors describe empirical FQ use as an independent risk factor for mortality (OR 0.172, indicating protection). The text describes how patients treated empirically with a FQ had lower mortality, and clearly explains why. I would recommend changing the wording in the abstract and in the results to separate out the factors that were truly associated with higher mortality (quinolone resistance, heme malignancy, etc).

As a reader, it seems fairly clear to me that FQ-resistance is somewhat of a surrogate marker for overall disease severity. I did appreciate that the authors drew attention to the significance of catheter retention related to FQ resistance.

Were these the only antibiotics used to treat SM bacteremia at your institution?

Did you look at follow up cultures for any development of resistance on therapy?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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.

Yes
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 recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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