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Dear editorial board of Scandinavian Journal of Infectious Diseases.

Please find enclosed the revised manuscript: “CD64 as a potential biomarker in septic arthritis”, by Oppegaard O and Skodvin B et al, to be submitted as an Original Article to BMC Infectious Diseases. We appreciate the constructive comments from the peer reviewers, and have revised the manuscript accordingly. The comments are addressed below.

Reviewer 1 (Vasileios Fotopoulos):

DISCRETIONAL REVISIONS

“In Septic arthritis group there is one case of Mycobacterium abscessus infection and one case of Lyme disease. We know that mycobacterial infections cause chronic, slow progressive monoarthritis rather than acute septic arthritis (duration of symptoms 30 days > 2 weeks)……

As for the Mycobacterial abscessus infection, the authors chose to include the case in the SA group. I was not familiar with this specific type of Mycobacteria (RGM – Rapidly Growing Mycobacteria), so it is my fault. However, even if the authors say that the duration of symptoms of 30 days mentioned, reflects the time to acquisition of blood samples and not to admission to hospital, I feel that this case should be excluded, especially when they try to explore the discriminatory power of a biomarker with rapid response time. Another objection of mine is that I can hardly consider this case an acute septic arthritis.”

R: We agree that the term “acute septic arthritis” is debatable when the duration of symptoms is 30 days, although the causative microbial agent was untreated during this period. To increase the conformity of the acute septic arthritis group we therefore have excluded this case as suggested.

Reviewer 2 (Saul Faust):

However, the final sentence of the conclusion (“Measurement of CD64 in joint fluid appears promising, and further studies are warranted.”) is repetition of the last paragraph of the discussion and the data that relates to this sentence is not included in this paper. This (currently final) sentence should therefore be removed from the conclusion prior to publication.

R: We concur, and have revised the manuscript accordingly.
We hope the editorial board will agree on the interest of this study.

Sincerely yours,

Oddvar Oppegaard and Brita Skodvin on the behalf of the authors.
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