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Dear Editor,

Many thanks for providing us an opportunity to revise the manuscript “Analysis of *S. epidermidis* icaA and icaD genes by polymerase chain reaction and slime production: a case control study” (MS: 1720275908701412).

We appreciate very much your important decision and comments for the original manuscript. We have finished the revision according to your comments and now return the revised version (Analysis of *S. epidermidis* icaA and icaD genes by polymerase chain reaction and slime production: a case control study _4th version) with the response to you. In this version, we have carefully addressed all points raised by you and make detailed revisions according to the suggestions. Our specific responses and the corresponding changes to each of the points are summarized on the following response sheet addressing to you and the changes in the revised manuscript (Analysis of *S. epidermidis* icaA and icaD genes by polymerase chain reaction and slime production: a case control study _4th version) have been marked in RED font.

In summary, the manuscript has been thoroughly revised and the concerns raised by the reviewers have been addressed carefully on a point-by-point basis. We believe that the revision has significantly improved the quality of the manuscript and hope that it will be accepted for publication. Thank you for your considerations.
Sincerely yours,

Bao Liu, M.M.

Department of Laboratory

Affiliated Provincial Hospital of Anhui Medical University
Response to the comments:

Note: the numbers of the line refer to the numbers of line in the 4th version.

Reviewer's report:

Authors have corrected the manuscript for the most part.

Some Minor Essential Revisions remain

1. L70, First sentence “Coagulase -negative staphylococci” staphylococci does not need to be italicized.

   Re: in the line 70 “staphylococci” instead of “staphylococci”. Thank you.

2. L80, In early study, change to “In an early study”

   Re: In the line 80 “an” was inserted. Thank you.

3. L84, “as a marker of the of”, delete second “of”

   Re: In the line 84 “of” was deleted. Thank you.

4. L140, L 150, L151, “MecA” should be “mecA”

   Re: In the line 140, 150, and 151 “mecA” instead of “MecA”. Thank you.
5. **L239, “Coagulase negative staphylococci” need not be italicized**

Re: In the line 239 “Coagulase negative staphylococci” instead of “Coagulase negative staphylococci”. Thank you.

6. **L250, “higher positive detection rate of positive”, delete “of positive”**

Re: in the line 250 “of positive” was deleted. Thank you.

7. **L251-252, Since this manuscript did not report any results on icaC, change “The present study has shown that the reason for the absence of biofilm production in some isolates, despite the presence of the ica operon, is the lack of icaC” to “The reason for the absence of biofilm production in some icaA and icaD positive isolates in the present study may be the lack of icaC [27]”**

Re: In the line 250-252 “The present study has shown that the reason for the absence of biofilm production in some isolates, despite the presence of the ica operon, is the lack of icaC” was replaced with “The reason for the absence of biofilm production in some icaA and icaD positive isolates in the present study may be the lack of icaC”