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The BMC Infectious Diseases Editorial Team

Enclosed, please find the revised version of our manuscript entitled "Nasal and perirectal colonization of vancomycin sensitive and resistant enterococci in patients of paediatrics ICU (PICU) of tertiary health care facilities". In your letter, you asked us to discuss the limitation of our study clearly and to ensure that the manuscript is copyedited. You also asked to answer the further comments raised by the reviewers on revised manuscript.

We have carefully revised the manuscript again according to the reviewer’s queries and a point-by-point reply to their comments is provided below. The limitation of study is also highlighted in the discussion section of the manuscript and it is thoroughly checked again to improve the quality of English.

We hope that the changes we have made in the new version of the manuscript have addressed all of the points raised by the reviewers, and that the manuscript is now acceptable for publication in BMC Infectious Diseases.

We are again very grateful to the reviewers for the time they spent reviewing the manuscript and to Editorial Team for reconsidering this work for publication in BMC Infectious Diseases.

Yours faithfully,

Muhammad Arfat Yameen

1. Point-by-point response to reviewer’s comments:

Reviewer: Maja Weisser

Reviewer's report: (Major Compulsory Revisions)

1. The study aim should be better defined: was the aim to describe local epidemiology?

Answer:

- The aim of study has been explain in detail in the background section. Now it is looking much improved and thanks for your guideline.

The study aim is still quite vague and should be focused. I guess the aim is the local epidemiology of nasal and rectal colonization with *E. faecium* and *E. faecalis* in PICU patients and correlation with clinical and socioeconomic factors.
3. English spelling is poor with many orthographic mistakes. Please consider sending the manuscript for language review.

Answer:

- Proof reading has been done and the quality of English has been improved wherever required.

English spelling could still be improved by sending the paper to a native speaking english person. Please note that in many positions the blank between two words is missing.

Answer:

- English spelling has been checked thoroughly again and blank space between words has been added.

4. From the BAA plate: how were colonies selected, at random? Knowing that patients are usually colonized with different enterococcal strains this is a relevant point and should be addressed.

Answer:

- The colonies which show specific identification characteristics like pinpoint colonies and colonies with black zone around, were selected for further processing.

This will not address the problem of diverse *E. faecium*, unless typing is performed.

Answer:

- Typing of *E. faecium* was not performed for this study but a further study on the same strains the typing is in progress in our laboratory.

5. Unclarities in the result section should be addressed:

- What stands the p-value for in the first 2 paragraphs of the result section
Answer:

- P value represents the result of Chi-Square test and has been added in the result section.

This still does not make sense to me, as these are not comparisons but descriptions. I would leave it away.

Answer:

- The explanation of Chi-Square test has been added with correction.

6. In the last paragraph of the result section entitled “Association between clinical diagnosis and enterococcal colonization” pneumonia is presented as a factor associated with enterococcal colonization, which is an interesting finding. Nevertheless, authors should show baseline characteristics in a table and declare, which factors they analysed for a potential association with enterococcal colonization. Also here, a separate analysis for E. faecium and E. faecalis would be useful.

Answer:

- Important risk factors studied have been added in the background, result and discussion section and table 5 consisting of analysis of risk factors and strains of enterococci has been added in the manuscript.

Table 5 is a description of risk factors but no risk factor analysis. Did you do a proper analysis?

Answer:

- Proper results of statistical analysis have been added. Thank you again for your kind guidance for improving manuscript.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest.

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

General comment about the quality of the English:

- The quality of English has been improved, wherever required and should be in good shape for publication.
There are still plenty of mistakes which need to be corrected before publication.

Answer:

- The Manuscript has been thoroughly checked again and quality of English has been improved.

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

2. **Point-by-point response to reviewer’s comments:**

**Reviewer: Bin Cao**

Reviewer's report:

The authors have answered most of my comments raised last time.

A suggestion is that the authors should mention limitations in the paragraph in the end of the discussion, such as this is only a microbiological surveillance study, no study of intervention to decrease colonization ratio, no analysis of nosocomial infections caused by VRE.

- The suggestion has been added in the discussion part. Thank you so much for your guidance and suggestions for improving the manuscript.

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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