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Dear Editor,

We want to thank very much the reviewers who made their best to improve our short report. Since they contributed so much, we took the liberty to acknowledge them in our manuscript. We hope that this is acceptable

To Dr. Martin Laass

1. We added a paragraph (page 5, rows 10-14) on how the *Sarcina ventriculi* was identified. This identification was done in a reference laboratory. Unfortunately, the reference laboratory can not give us more details, but the method is described in a reference 4.

2. *Sarcina* was identified by sequencing because previously we had no experience with *Sarcinae*. Later, when we found *Sarcinae* in faeces we could identify them by morphology

3. We corrected “faecal pathogens and *C. difficile*”, thank you. We also commented that in our opinion the symptoms were caused by a blood-borne infection (page 5, rows 19-20).

4. We want to present the other pictures to demonstrate that the size of *Sarcinae* is comparable to mounds. It is such big cocciae that we first thought that it could be mould when we studied the gram-staining from the blood bottle but the growth in an anaerobic bottle made us suspect that it could be a giant bacteria that we have never seen before.
5. We erased this phrase. We meant that we could demonstrate Sarcinae in blood.

   The question was raised by Dr. Ferrier

6. We explained why the patient is susceptible (page 6, rows 19-23, reference 9)

7. We clarified the sentence

8. We wanted to show the dispute around the issue. We want to leave this citation.

9. Abbreviations are spelled out

10. We corrected the spelling mistakes, thank you

To Dr. Dora Lam-Himlin

1. Thank you very much for your kind comments and the article. We commented on the possibility of the bacteria entry into the bloodstream (page 6, rows 19-23, ref.9).

2. We added the conclusion you so kindly suggested (page 7, starting from row 3)

3. We also referred to your article (ref.8). We found a lot of interesting data, however we dare to disagree that Sarcinae are aerotolerant. They are strict anaerobic.

4. We made minor essential revisions. The size of the cocciae is not shown. Instead, we show other common bacteria to compare the size.

5. There is no special mention in the patient history about her vomiting.

With all improvements done to the paper, we hope that it is now acceptable for the publication

Sincerely

Tamara Tuuminen, MD, PhD
Specialist in clinical microbiology