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Reviewer's report:

In this manuscript, the authors described that S.epidermidis bacteria were significant nosocomial pathogens, and icaA/D could clarify the different adhesion mechanisms in the pathogenesis of infections associated with medical devices. This manuscript is interesting.

In sum, the questions posed by the authors were well defined.

The methods appropriate and well described.

Data sounds convincing.

In my view, this manuscript met the relevant standards for publication after some revisions and editing.

Minor revisions

In the “Bacterial strains”, the author states “Twenty-two S.epidermidis studied were isolated from patient blood taken from intravascular catheters. ---”. Patients or patient? The period of selection? The patients are Consecutive cases? The statement is too simple.

The discussion looks not very good; you’d better highlight the novelty points and the importance of your finding in this work, rather than describe the results. I suggest that you should rewrite the “discussion”, and move the data description portions into the “Results” section.

Limitations of the work stated are too general. The limitation is suitable to many papers other than this paper. The authors should state some specials related to this study.

The authors are non-English speaking, so some of their grammar can be polished, but this criticism will not be held against them, in a major way for the Scientific Content. The other reviewer(s) may hold a different opinion. The authors should get help with their grammar/syntax.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being
Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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