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**Reviewer's report:**

The authors have complied with most of the comments and the paper has improved accordingly.

However, they did not refer to Seifert's paper (JCM 2005, 43, 4328-4335) while from the previous version (their reference 29 in that version), it could be traced that the Seifert's protocol was used. The Seifert's paper is a reference paper for the technical performance of PFGE and important for the readership. On the other hand, in the latest revision, they cite a paper from Tenover for profile interpretation, but that paper refers to criteria for type designation during clearcut outbreaks and is not focused on Acinetobacter. The authors have made clear their criteria for type allocation and this is fine. (The message is clear and they showed that there were different types in both groups of organisms). It is suggested to do as follows:

Line 10, insert reference Seifert et al.

Line 12-13: Delete 'DNA ..... Tenover [23] and'.

Line 17: delete 'In brief,`

Inclusion of the pictures would improve the paper, but I will leave that to the authors and editor.

**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.