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Dear Philippa Harris,

Thank you for helping to review and improve the submitted manuscript. The authors have worked to clarify, condense, and focus the manuscript.

We have clarified numerous parts of the paper as requested by the reviewers. We have added explanations to clarify why anaerobic cultures were not performed, described the depth of coverage of the molecular testing, described how sequences were assigned to taxa, described the subjects and wounds that were tested, added a paragraph regarding the limitations of the study, more clearly formatted the numeric results within the discussion, further described the statistical analysis and the importance of the odds ratio, added titles to the figures, removed a figure, and cited and discussed additional relevant articles.

We have condensed the manuscript by eliminating parts of the Background, Results & Discussion, and Conclusion. We have focused the manuscript by addressing how this study is different from other previously published articles and by emphasizing the clinical relevance of our findings.

We are confident that our resubmitted manuscript is an improvement, and we are confident that this study provides new and important information for clinicians and scientists who are concerned about bacteria in wounds and concerned about bacterial testing in general. We hope these changes are to your satisfaction.

Sincerely,

Dan Rhoads