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Reviewer's report:

Major revisions
1. Introduction: There needs to be more information in the Introduction regarding the pathogenicity of M. hominis, U. parvum and U. urealyticum, in particular as there is contention to the pathogenicity of the latter two.

2. Materials and Methods: Include the treatment guidelines for the individuals in this study. More information is required on the demographics of this group to aid in comparisons. Were any of the participants symptomatic? Or were they treated only if tested positive? Were any other urogenital pathogens tested for, even if not a part of this study? eg. N. gonorrhoea, C. trachomatis or M. genitalium.

3. Materials and Methods: Were there any discordant samples in the colourmetric assay? (ie. colours in between the yellow and orange/red)

4. Materials and Methods: Reword and shorten sentence beginning “Strains were regarded as resistant.” as it is confusing.

5. Materials and Methods/Results: State the statistical methodologies used.

6. Discussion: Could the difference in antibiotic resistance levels seen in Ureaplasma spp. from reference [5] be due to the species that were detected? (Pages 7/8)

7. Discussion: The comparison of data sets (pages 7 and 8) can be summarised to avoid repetition. Possibly a table could be included to show these differences and then only highlight data of significance? How did the demographics of the participants differ?

8. Discussion: The first paragraph on page 9 (“The susceptibilities of genital..”) can be removed or greatly summarised as your study did not involve tet(M) gene sequencing.

9. Discussion: The second paragraph on page 9 (Roberts [27] proposed..”) is far too long and be summarised in a few sentences to get the main point across.

Minor revisions
10. Ensure consistency of terminology, in particular when “Ureaplasma” or “Mycoplasma” is used.

Discretionary revisions
11. Another possible limitation of the study would be the inability to test for other
Mycoplasma spp. such as M. genitalium. The authors can mention this and also state whether any commercial assays exist that incorporate all targets.
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