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Reviewer's report:

Review of: Use of multiple methods for genotyping Fusarium during an outbreak of contact lens associated fungal keratitis in Singapore

The authors assessed the genetic diversity of Fusarium keratitis outbreak isolates using three molecular typing schemes. Not surprisingly, they found that AFLP provided the greatest discriminatory power. I am returning an edited version of this manuscript as a pdf in an effort to improve the presentation. My main criticism is that no effort was made to connect their findings with those reported in citation 3, even though 10 isolates from Chang et al. 2006 were included in their study. This reviewer feels that inclusion of this comparison is essential to connect their findings with those of Chang et al. 2006. Additional specific suggestions and criticisms are listed below page-by-page.

1.1. Throughout the manuscript the authors should not use the name Fusarium solani for any isolate. Instead, they should refer to isolates as members of the Fusarium solani species complex (FSSC).

2.2 Here and elsewhere it is unclear whether all of the outbreak isolates were members of the FSSC.

3.10-11. In references 8-10, the isolates are not identified to species.

4.23. Was the Fusarium oxysporum an outbreak isolate? I recommend using F. cf. incarnatum because several different species are being referred to by this name.

5.6. Recommend using FSSC for F. solani.

6.1-11. What minimal fluorescent intensity was used and how many bands were scored?

6.16. What was the Mg concentration?

11.19-24. The information referred to as â##data not shownâ## absolutely needs to be incorporated into the Results section so that a direct comparison of their results and those reported in citations 3 and 7 can be made. Specifically, which isolates from citation 3 were included in their study and what AFLP and REP-PCR groups did they nest in? Also, given that the authors found that the isolates from citation 3 were nested in one more AFLP and REP-PCR group that
the MLST groups reported in 3, they should clearly explain the concord and discord, and offer some explanation on why they found one more group and reported in citation 3.

12.15. The authors need to connect their genotyping results with those reported in citations 3 and 7.

Fig. 1. The authors need to indicate where the isolates are housed and that they are available for distribution. Information explaining Location needs to be included in the figure legend. AFLP, Rep-PCR and ERIC group for many of the isolates is missing. This needs some explanation. Were these isolates analyzed?

**What next?:** Accept after minor essential revisions

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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

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