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Dear Authors,

I carefully read and review the manuscript entitled "Paediatric Focal Intracranial Suppurative Infection: a UK single-centre retrospective cohort study" (BPED-D-18-00337) for BMC Pedaitrics.

My general consideration for this manuscript is positive. Because the van der Velden et al. report descriptive retrospective focal intracranial suppurative infection admitted between January 2001 and June 2016 in Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom. The manuscript is interesting.

Major criticism:

1. The glikopeptid of teicoplanin is used instead of vancomycin; As known the penetration of teicoplanin to CSF is limited. Why did the authors used teicoplanin and lineozolid? What is the reason for less using of vancomycin?

Minor criticism:

2. I wonder if the patients with focal intracranial suppurative infection who has unexpected course were searched for underlying undiagnosed primary immune deficiency?

3. What is the screening panel of PCR?

4. The antibiotics resistant of the grew microorganism were not addressed; ie penicillin resistance for the isolated pneumococci strains.
5. I advised authors to discuss and used the literature attached.

**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.

Yes

**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 am able to assess the statistics

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

Acceptable
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