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Reviewer’s report:

Streptococcus agalactiae in Brazil: serotype distribution, virulence determinants and antimicrobial susceptibility

Second review

I think the paper reads much better now and I think it should be accepted. I have some comments where the sentences do not read well and could be rewritten. I believe the question is now well defined, the methods are appropriate and well described. The data could be more sound if more information was available, but the authors have stated this information was not available. The manuscript adheres to normal reporting standards, the discussion is sound with limitations stated clearly in the revised manuscript. The title and abstract are accurate and the English is acceptable.

All of the following are minor essential revisions:

1. Statistical analysis, first paragraph: Presumably the following was a typo where you have written; “Significance was considered when values were > 0.05”. This should read <0.05.

2. Discussion, first paragraph: Typo: “and as an important cause of neonatal sepsis and meningitis” should read “and is an important cause of neonatal sepsis and meningitis”

3. Discussion, second paragraph: Please rewrite the following as it does not flow well and expand on the limitations that you encountered “Nevertheless, the limitations associated with the interpretation with those data need to be highlighted, given that our observations might not fully and accurately represent each one of the five geographical regions”.

4. Discussion, third paragraph: Please rewrite the following “In this study, the six most common serotypes (Ia, Ib-V) were detected in various frequencies, according to the region, while serotypes VI to VIII were not found. This fact is not uncommon, since these serotypes are still rarely reported [9]”.

5. Discussion, fifth paragraph: Please rewrite the following “Therefore, it is not discarded the possibility that the group of NT isolates may include representatives of this serotype”.
6. Discussion, seventh paragraph: Please change: “If this is not possible, the treatment with vancomycin is recommended [19]” to read “if this is not possible, then treatment with vancomycin is recommended [19].”

7. Discussion, eighth paragraph Please rewrite the following as it is confusing “Among the EriR isolates, the ermA gene was the most frequent, but the cMLSB phenotype carrying the ermB gene was the most common, followed by the iMLSB and M phenotypes that harbored the ermA gene”.

8. Discussion, eighth paragraph: Please rewrite “Also, other resistance mechanisms, such as mutations, can also be speculated”.

9. Discussion, eighth paragraph: 17 EriR should read 17 EryR

10. Table 1: please sort the serotypes (rather than prevalence) so all of the types are in the same order, at present they are jumbled and more difficult to compare between the samples

11. Table 2: it would be good to have percentages in the table for the presence of the bac or bca genes

The following is a discretionary revision:

If you do not have the data available to say whether the urine samples you tested are from pregnant women, you should be wary of discussing the predominance of capsule types in pregnant women.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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