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Reviewer's report:

• Major compulsory Revisions
Once this revision is done, the work is recommended for publication

1) I suggest including in the Abstract the results obtained with icaB and icaC since the title of the work and its content make reference to the production of icaADBC.

2) Table 1 should be revised since it shows data that do not coincide with those in Table 2 and with the manuscript (Results, paragraph 2, line 8). The total number of IS256-A+ IS256-D genes detected for non-epidermidis CoNS in Table 2 is 6 whereas in Table 1, the total number is 7. Similarly, in Table 2 the total number of icaA+IcaD genes for non-epidermidis CoNS is 7 whereas in Table 1, it is 3.

• Discretionary revisions

2) It should be of interest to know the number of isolates of S. epidermidis presented by genes icaB and icaC, so I suggest including them in Results.
3) Although the PCR technique is well-known, I recommend the authors to describe it instead of citing other people’s works.
4) The Figure included in the manuscript only shows icaA. I think the work would be more comprehensible and complete if a figure showing icaB, icaC and icaD genes is also included

• Minor Essential Revisions
There are some spelling mistakes that should be corrected before publication.

1) Abstract: line 19, “even though” instead of “even thought”, line 16, “Although” instead of “Despite”.

2) Background: paragraph 1, “species” instead of “specie” (the word “species” is both the singular and plural form); last paragraph, “device-related infections” instead of “device related-infections”.

3) Method: “For CVC-related bacteremia/sepsis”, the acronym CVC should be written in its complete form the first time it is used.
4) Results: paragraph 1, “all the included strains” instead of “all strains included”; paragraph 3, “although” instead of “despite”.

5) Discussion: paragraph 1, line 4, “required to eradicate” instead of “require for eradicating”; line 14, “with non-S. epidermidis CoNS” instead of “with non-epidermidis”; line 15, “collected isolates” instead of “isolates collected”.

6) Conclusions: line 2, “even though” instead of “even thought”.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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