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Reviewer’s report:

As mentioned previously the manuscript is informative and shows the need to identify clinical cultures properly. However, I have still some remarks.

1) Page 2 line 17: culturing will not help but reliable and fast identification will probably help to detect pseudobacterimia and other pseudo infections.
2) Shorten of the genus name is not always consistent. Please check that.
3) On page 4 line 21: No common exposures….sampling were noted. Why were the bloodcultures taken?
4) Page 5 line 14: Enterobacter clinical….than 0.8%. This sentence does not make sense. Please re-write, or better send it to an manuscript editor.
5) Page 5 line 20 and figure 1: Did you perform hsp60 sequencing on 1 or all isolates?
   And confirm that all three isolates must be E. nimipressuralis by IRS-PCR or where all three isolates identified with hsp60 gene fragment sequence analyze?
6) Page 6 line 10-11: After all E. amnigenus was not isolated at all. Therefore, it might be a bit strange to mention this species in your discussion as clinical significance remains unclear. (this also counts for page 2 line 12, page 6 line 21, page 7 line 4, and page 7 line 9 remove E. amnigenus or)
7) Phoenotypic must be phenothypic
8) Figure legend Figure 2. Salined cotton isolate identified as E. nimipressuralis instead of salined cotton isolate classified as E. amnigenus.