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**Reviewer's report:**

I feel the authors have addressed the majority of my comments in the revised submission. I only have 2 areas for consideration.

1. I believe the authors misunderstood my previous comment regarding the omission of results in the Abstract for H. flu and M. cat. They disagreed with my comment and mentioned data in tables 4 and 5. This was not my point. My point is that I would suggest to include a comment in the Abstract, not the results section in the body of the manuscript, regarding PD exposures for H. flu and M. cat. In the results section of the abstract, only data for S. pneumo are presented. The conclusion of the abstract mentions all three pathogens but I would suggest adding data on H. flu and M. cat to the Results section of the Abstract.

2. My only other comment deals with Table 3. The column for fraction unbound still needs some clarification. The column title is fraction unbound with an asterisk to the footnote that begins "Fraction unbound (protein binding) . . ." Without question, fraction unbound and protein binding are not the same. For amox +/- clav and cefaclor, the fraction unbound numbers are correct. For the FQs, the numbers presented in the table are values for protein binding. Since levofloxacin is 24-38% protein bound, the fraction unbound is 62-76%. The fraction unbound for gatifloxacin and moxifloxacin should be 78-82% and 49.5-70%, respectively. I would like to see consistency with the numbers in the table.
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