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Reviewer’s report:

Assessment of the manuscript "Antimicrobial resistance in ophthalmic infections: a multi-centre analysis across UK care settings"

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?

- Authors clearly stated the lack of UK data on antimicrobial prescribing in relation to local resistance pattern as the basis for the retrospective study. However, linked antimicrobial prescribing and clinical outcome data were not available for the authors to effectively address the lack of data on antimicrobial prescribing in the UK.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?

- Retrospective analysis (though limited) used is appropriate for the study design and was well described

3. Are the data sound?

- The data are sound

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?

- Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

- Yes

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
- The limitations of the retrospective study design were clearly stated and authors thoroughly described how the limitations were addressed or to be addressed.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
- Not applicable

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
- Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?
- Acceptable

Minor Revisions

Title

- Since the study was on a retrospective analysis of bacterial agents of ophthalmic infections, the more appropriate term would have been 'antibacterial resistance', although 'antimicrobial resistance' which is broader, is most times generally but inappropriately used. The title should therefore be modified as "Antibacterial resistance in ophthalmic infections: a multi-centre retrospective analysis across UK care settings"

Abstract

Conclusions:

There was no description in the methodology or result section that supports the concluding statement "We find significant antimicrobial susceptibility-policy mismatches…." This statement should be modified or deleted.

Introduction

- Line 39-41: The statement "Table 1 describes national and local secondary care guidance for the pharmacological management of bacterial conjunctivitis" should be re-casted. It is not appropriate to be reporting table in introduction (although table may be cited).
Methods

- The subtitle “Study setting” should appropriately read "Study setting and design"

- The specimens from which those organisms were recovered should reflect under the methodology (although this appeared in the result section under patient demographics, which is inappropriate). Authors cannot describe in the result section what they have not stated in the methodology

Results

Patient demographics:

The following statement "Eye cultures were obtained from various sources including eye swabs (2358/2681, 88.0%), conjunctival swabs (98/2681, 3.7%), contact lens swabs (54/2681, 2.0%), corneal scrapes (148/2681, 5.5%), and invasive samples (23/2681, 0.8%)" should not be part of patient demographics. This is better put under pathogen distribution, which should now be renamed "Specimen and pathogen distribution"

Level of interest

The findings of this article are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English

- Acceptable

Statistical review

-The manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

Declaration of competing interests

- I declare that I have no competing interests

- Accept with minor revision
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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:

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declared that I have no competing interests
I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal