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Reviewer’s report:

In this study, the authors describe the effects of U parvum infection of rat bladders and of BPH cell cultures. Several changes in protein expression were listed, although the cellular distribution of filamin A was the most noted. I found this MS very difficult to read in part because the figures were incorrectly cited, the methods section was too long and not written in the same order as the results, and many of the figures should be deleted. This MS definitely needs a rewrite to make it more understandable to this reviewer.

Examples and other comments are below.

1. Page 3. The disease associations of ureaplasmas are listed in the first paragraph, but this is a bit misleading because ureaplasmas are now divided into two species, U. urealyticum and U. parvum. It would be more informative if the authors described the disease associations of U. parvum, not ureaplasmas in general.

2. Could the methods section be shortened and written in the order of the experiments cited in results?

3. Pg 14. The figure citations seem to be mixed up. What is listed as Fig 3A and C should be cited Fig 2. This mislabeling continues throughout the MS and makes it very difficult to read.

4. Why are there no red and green colors in what is labeled as Fig 2 ABD & E, although they are colored in C, F, G, and H?

5. Pg 14, last paragraph, first line. There is no ELISA data shown in Fig 4 (listed as 5A and 5B).

6. The Western blot is not convincing as presented in what is labeled Fig 4. Any differences in the bands seen are very slight. Also what are the two large bands at the bottom of the gel in the cytosolic fractions?

7. What is labeled as Fig 3 and Fig 5C should be deleted – it’s sufficient to just note the %, SEs and P values in the text.

8. Do the authors think that the filamin A reorganization in tissue cells is specific to UP or could the same effect also be noted with any bacterial infection?
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