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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is well-written and comprehensive. However, there are some problems to be clarified.

(1) Levofloxacin is not included in the AST panel in early 2000s. Did the authors store all the isolates and re-test the MICs of levofloxacin in this study?

(2) Polymicrobial bacteremia is a major confounding issue for patients with SM bacteremia. The authors classify it as an infection source in table 2 is not adequate. Please separate it as a single category and analyze its effect.

(3) The definite treatment part is confusing. Only 24.8% of patients receive TMP/SMX. Please discuss it in the discussion part.

(4) In table 1, the length of stay before bacteremia is not significantly different between survivors and non-survivors. Please be sure it is correct (12 days versus 26 days should be significantly different)

(5) Please provide the definition of hypoalbuminemia

(6) In a previous study about SM bacteremia in cancer patients (Cancer. 2006 May 1;106(9):1967-73.), SM due to catheter related bacteremia has good prognosis compared to other sites of infection. Try to explain lack of difference in this study. Due to lack of effective treatment?

(7) Please explain the last row of Table 2

(8) Only 125 cases in Table 4 (126 case in table 1). Cause?
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