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Reviewer's report:

Reviewer Comments
The manuscript by Birtukan et al. was improved during the last review. However, there are still some points to address.

Even though Author response to reviewer’s comments not properly addressed all the questions raised by all the reviewers and The main changes are not marked or highlighted in manuscript.

1. In general, the manuscript was improved for English level. However, there is still English improvement to do.

2. In abstract section result and conclusion part should be improvement suggested to draw the reader attention

3. There is no CLSI citation in the AST; Authors should cite recent 2014 CLSI guideline.

4. Why authors not used cefoxitin for AST of S.aureus. If possible perform and include screening for methicillin resistant Staphylococcus aureus and conform how many of S. aureus isolates were Methicillin resistant (MRSA)?

5. The discussion can be shorted since the comparison with other studies could be summarized. Also, some part of the discussion is repeat of the results. Try to avoid repeat results in the discussion section.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

Declaration of competing interests:

I declare that I have no competing interests’