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Reviewer's report:

General

The paper is much improved, but there are still several issues that were not fully addressed in the revised paper.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. The conclusion in the abstract still needs some rephrasing. For example: "According to our experience and the literature review, data regarding the optimal therapy of BV infection are limited. Current evidence support a favorable result with third generation cephalosporins, piperacillin-tazobactam and ciprofloxacin, while the efficacy of ampicillin-sulbactam needs further evaluation".
2. Should state according to Duke's criteria whether SBE in this case is definite, probable, possible…
3. Disk diffusion – state that plates were read after >24h of incubation contrary to CLSI recommendation for Pseudomonas. The limitation of A/S testing without an MIC method should be better explained. This contradicts the current statement that A/S is not suitable for BV.
4. I still believe that such a case should be treated for 6 weeks and that gentamicin doses should have been higher.
5. If femoral-inguinal symptoms are ascribed to embolism, state this explicitly.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
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