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COVER LETTER 2

Reviewer's report

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The authors of the article gave brief replies to the majority of the comments resulting from the first manuscript. However it is always difficult to know different species of ESBL-PE,

   New table 2 added to give information about different species of ESBL-PE to also know if on admission they diagnosed infections with ESBL-producing microorganism.

   Page 6 : added : “On admission, none diagnosed infection was in relation with ESBL-producing microorganism.”

2. On page 7 of the manuscript, the authors indicated that they have isolated 266 ESBL-PE strains; but it is difficult to verify this number in the manuscript.

   266 was not the number of ESBL-PE strains. The correction is 233 ESBL-PE strains (page 7 and table 2)

   The figures added by the authors do not bring extra information?. The figure 2 is difficult to understand. I suggested removing these figures and introducing keys information into the text.

   Figure 2 removed.

3. Table 2 still poses problems in its organization and presentation. Why they presented the results of susceptibility test by origin? Could be possible as suggested by other reviewer to distinguish community and hospital acquired strains? It should not be forgotten that all these bacterial strains are ESBL-producers and probably have the same resistance profile. In this table it appears that some strains remain susceptible to amoxicillin.

   Table 3 replace table2 and focuse only on community and hospital acquired strains

4. On page 8 authors included intracranial catheters as one of significant risk factors for ESBL-PE hospital acquisition in univariate analysis but the Table 4 showed the contrary (p= 0.08 > 0.05).

   Thank you for this comment. It’s a mistake. We corrected page 8. The good analysis is in the table 5 (old table4)

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Authors should check antibiotics name 2. In the double-disk synergy and susceptibility tests, authors used clavulanic acid disk alone or in combination?

   Checking done (page
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