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Athens November 3rd, 2010

Dear editor of the journal BMC Infectious Diseases

I would like to ask you to review for the original research section of the Journal BMC Infectious Diseases the attached revised manuscript entitled: “Ampicillin / Sulbactam versus Cefuroxime as Antimicrobial Prophylaxis for Cesarean Section: a Randomized Study” by Ziogos et al.

The authors would like to thank the editorial staff for the preliminary acceptance of this manuscript. Please find below a detailed item by item response to the comments raised by the editorial staff.

All authors have contributed significantly to this work and have seen and approved this manuscript. This manuscript has not been previously published and is not being considered for publication elsewhere. There are no potential conflicts of interest for the participating authors. The study was registered in the NIH clinical trials registry (Clinicaltrials.gov identifier: NCT01138852).

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any further questions regarding this manuscript.

Sincerely,

Sotirios Tsiodras, MD, MSc,PhD
Detailed response to the editorial comments

EDITORIAL REQUESTS

Editorial comment: “…Dear Dr Tsiodras, Peer review of your manuscript (above) is now complete, and we are delighted, in principle, to accept the manuscript for publication in BMC Infectious Diseases…”

Authors’ response: The authors would like to thank the editorial staff for this decision.

Editorial request 1: “…However, before acceptance, we would urge you to further improve the manuscript in response to these editorial requests:

- Please acknowledge anyone who contributed towards the study by making substantial contributions to conception, design, acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data, or who was involved in drafting the manuscript or revising it critically for important intellectual content, but who does not meet the criteria for authorship. Please also include their source(s) of funding. Please also acknowledge anyone who contributed materials essential for the study. Authors should obtain permission to acknowledge from all those mentioned in the Acknowledgements. Please list the source(s) of funding for the study, for each author, and for the manuscript preparation in the acknowledgements section. Authors must describe the role of the funding body, if any, in study design; in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript; and in the decision to submit the manuscript for publication. If you have no 'Acknowledgements' to make, please include this title and declare no acknowledgements…”.

Authors’ response: This was done as suggested by the editorial staff. No acknowledgements were necessary and a statement to this effect was added in the revised manuscript.

Editorial request 2: “- In addition, please can you state the name of the ethical committee that approved your study....”

Authors’ response: This was performed and a statement to this effect was added in the revised manuscript.

Editorial request 3: “…Please also highlight (with 'tracked changes' / coloured / under-lines/ highlighted text) all changes made when revising the manuscript to make it easier for the Editors to give you a prompt decision on your manuscript…”

Authors’ response: This was performed as requested.