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Reviewer’s report:

Dear author,

The manuscript is very informative and shows that reliable identification of Enterobacter species is important. Also, it is clearly shown that phenotypic identification of Enterobacter species is unreliable, as well. As has been shown recently, a better identification could potentially lead to a better understanding of which Enterobacter species are more infectious, or pathogenic than other Enterobacter species (1,2,3)

• I’m convinced that the isolated Enterobacter species are all identical and most likely they are also E. nimipressuralis. However, recent papers showed that identification with 16S partial sequencing is not sufficient to differentiate between all Enterobacter cloaceae complex species. Therefore, I think it will improve the manuscript if you add sequencing a fragment of hsp60 or rpoB as recently be described (1,2,3).

• Possibly the case descriptions can be shorted because these are of little relevance. It is enough to mention the reason of hopalization and that there were no clinical signs of infection.

Furthermore some small issues
Page 2 line 5 and is in italic
Page 3 line 5: etc. complete the list that is monitored
Page 5 line: 2, page 6 line 12; specie to species
Page 8 line 10 Enterobacter in italic
1)Population genetics of the nomenspecies Enterobacter cloaceae.
Hoffmann H, Roggenkamp A.
2)Genomic diversity within the Enterobacter cloaceae complex.
Paauw A, Caspers MP, Schuren FH, Leverstein-van Hall MA, Delétoile A, Montijn RC, Verhoef J, Fluit AC.
3)Specific distribution within the Enterobacter cloaceae complex of strains isolated from infected orthopedic implants.
Morand PC, Billoet A, Rottman M, Sivadon-Tardy V, Eyrolle L, Jeanne L, Tazi A,
Anract P, Courpied JP, Poyart C, Dumaine V.