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Executive editor
BMC Infectious Diseases

Dear Prof Philippa Harris

SUBMISSION OF FULL LENGTH ARTICLE ENTITLED: “ANTIMICROBIAL SUSCEPTIBILITY PATTERNS OF UREAPLASMA SPECIES AND MYCOPLASMA HOMINIS IN PREGNANT WOMEN”

Thank you for the valuable comments and recommendations on our article. Please find the revised manuscript for possible publication in the Journal: BMC Infectious Diseases. The abovementioned manuscript: “Antimicrobial susceptibility patterns of Ureaplasma species and Mycoplasma hominis in pregnant women” or information has not been published as the focus of a research article before and has not been submitted elsewhere for publication. All the authors and recognised parties have agreed to the submission of this article.

According to the reviewers’ suggestions, the following have been addressed:

Reviewer 1: Anna-Maria Costa

Discretionary revisions:
1. The word “antenatal” has been removed from the title.
2. Sentence has been removed and the information was elaborated on in more detail (Introduction, par 1).
3. Most of the percentages listed in the text (Results, par 2) correspond to those listed in Table 1. However, resistance of Ureaplasma spp. and mixed isolates to erythromycin are listed in the text as 80% and 97%, respectively while in the table it amounts to 79% and 96%, respectively. This is because resistance at the different breakpoints resulted in percentages with decimals <0.5. Nonetheless, when added together the decimals exceeded 0.5, resulting in the 1% difference.

It is also important to note that the susceptibility of Ureaplasma spp. to levofloxacin and moxifloxacin were reported in the text as 59% and 98%, respectively. In Table 1 it may appear that the susceptibility of Ureaplasma spp. to levofloxacin and moxifloxacin were only 52% and 93%, respectively. It should be taken into consideration that some of the Ureaplasma positive specimens were entirely susceptible (i.e. not growing at any of the antimicrobial agent breakpoints indicated in the table) to these two antimicrobial agents (7% to levofloxacin and 5% to moxifloxacin). The ‘entirely susceptible’ ones were not included in the table.

4. Discussion:
   a. The references have been added to the sentence referring to other studies (Page 8).
   b. The first sentence of paragraph six has been removed as it seemed unnecessary.
Reviewer 2: Jimmy Twin

Major compulsory revisions:

1. More information on the pathogenicity of *M. hominis* and *Ureaplasma* spp. has been added (Introduction, par 1).
2. Some demographics of the participants have been given (Results, par 1); the treatment guidelines have been included (Discussion, par 7); *Mycoplasma genitalium* was tested for as part of a larger study, however, it was outside of the scope of this article to include this as the Mycofast Revolution assay does not allow for the detection of the bacterium. For this reason the authors focused on *M. hominis* and *Ureaplasma* spp.
3. Materials and methods: There were no discordant results with regards to the colour changes (Results, par 1).
4. Materials and methods: Sentence 2 in paragraph 3 was reworded and made shorter by splitting it into two sentences.
5. Materials and methods: The statistical methodologies used are stated at the end of the materials and method section.
6. Discussion: The authors stated more clearly that the difference in antibiotic resistance levels seen in *Ureaplasma* spp. from references [1], [8] and [25] could be due to the specific species that was detected (Par 2).
7. Discussion: The comparison of the data sets on originally pages 7 and 8 were summarised as suggested. The two paragraphs were merged and shortened and it was stated how the demographics differ (Page 8).
8. Discussion: The information about the tet(M) gene has been removed (Par 5, page 10).
9. Discussion: Paragraph 6 on page 10 has been shortened.

Minor revisions:

10. Changed and verified the correctness and consistency of terminology. ‘Genital mycoplasmas‘ were used when referring to mycoplasmas in general.

Discretionary revisions:

11. It has been stated briefly that there is no commercial assay incorporating all the genital mycoplasmas, including *Mycoplasma genitalium* (Discussion, par 9, page 11).

Kind regards

Mr MJ Redelinghuys
PhD student in Medical Microbiology
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