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Reviewer's report:

Report on revised version El Aila et al.

I have carefully read the reply letter of the authors. I think the authors did their best to improve the paper, taking most of the reviewers comments into account.

I have two small remarks:

Concerning my point 4, with answer 26 (A26). The sentence is still really unclear. Also S. pneumoniae is misspelled (lacking an è`). I propose the following:

It is of clinical relevance to rapidly and specifically detect S. pneumoniae. Therefore several PCR assays have been developed over the past decades.

Response to Point 8, Answer 30 (A30). I do believe that the paper would have been stronger showing the sequence data of at least the four P. pseudopneumoniae strains. I also understand that this would be a substantial amount of work, but not difficult. I would be a nice proof of principle for the method to validate when a method is established in a paper.

All other points were addressed properly.
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