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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Ethics - The authors state on their cover letter and in their methods that "Written informed consent for participation in the study was obtained from patients." However this was a retrospective study and I'm unclear if/how this could have been done. If the study was granted exempt status as stated, then it's more likely that the requirement for informed consent would have been waived by an ethics board. This should be clarified.

2. Methods - The authors need to clearly state their inclusion criteria and how they identified eligible population i.e. solely from micro data or micro plus imaging or other. If micro criteria was only abscess fluid positivity, how did they ensure that KLA patients who did not undergo drainage but had + blood cultures were not missed? Also there is no information on how the clinical data was collected, i.e. medical record review, or at which time point the lab data was taken. Clinical outcomes such as “prognosis” are used but not defined, “mortality” also not defined etc.

Overall, although one of the authors' aims was to add clinical data to what is already published from China on KLA epidemiology and micro, the clinical aspects are the weakest in this paper. Perhaps the authors should reconsider submitting with a purely a micro angle if they are unable to account for the issues above.

3. Results – The sections on comparisons of clinical characteristics report various comparisons which are all NOT statistically significant. The results are also not presented consistently, ie some are shown as Ns, others as percentages, and not all P values are shown.

Minor Essential Revisions

4. Use of the acronyms PLA and KLA is inconsistent and can be confusing to the reader. Would suggest using KLA throughout.

5. Line 85-86: The authors state that prevalence of KLA is “high, while only some KLA cases were documented.” This statement is unclear in meaning.

6. There are numerous spelling and grammatical errors throughout. Examples from the abstract: Line 27 “pathogens” should be “pathogen”; Line 31
“consecutive 45 patients” should be “45 consecutive patients”; Line 32: “Jun 2008” should be “June 2008”; Line 43: “cKP” needs to be spelled out at first use...

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

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

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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