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Reviewer's report:

As the authors explain in the abstract/introduction, streptococci are frequently cited as contaminants. The method used to define infection here is a bacterial volume of 1+ or greater in BAL or 2+ or greater in sputum - I am not aware of any data supporting the validity of this definition. How do you know this does not simply represent contamination?

We know from the existing literature that strep milleri group are a frequent cause of pleural infection - what does this paper tell us that we did not already know?

Was pH or the presence of bacteria on Gram strain not included in the definitions of complicated effusion or empyema thoracis?

What is "bacterial pleurisy" - I do not know this condition. Does this mean pleural infection? i.e complicated parapneumonic effusion or empyema?

Abstract- Change pus formation to "empyema".

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:
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