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Author's response to reviews:

The BioMed Central Editorial Team
BMC Infectious Diseases

Dear Sir,

RE: Discretionary revision of manuscript No. 900064582484498 “Pseudomonas aeruginosa in a neonatal intensive care unit: molecular epidemiology and infection control measures”

Thank you for the detailed review of this work and for considering to accept the manuscript for publication in BMC Infectious Diseases. We have carefully examined the issue raised by Referee 2 and modified the manuscript accordingly. A response to the comment raised by Referee 2 with the description of the changes is enclosed.

We believe that with these revisions the paper is now suitable for publication, and hope that the Editorial Staff agrees.

Yours sincerely,

Raffaele Zarrilli, M.D., Ph.D.,
Dipartimento di Scienze Mediche Preventive
Università di Napoli "Federico II"
Via Pansini 5, 80131 Napoli, Italy
E-mail: rafzarri@unina.it
Referee 2: discretionary revision.
1) It is interesting that compliance before patient contact is in all periods higher than after patient contact. This is in contrast to most other studies. Do you have an explanation for this? At least one sentence in the discussion should give an explanation or rise the question.

Response:
We thank the Reviewer for her/his comment and suggestion.

The statistical analysis of hand disinfection compliance before and after patient contact showed that “hand disinfection compliance of HCWs before and after patient contact proved to be significantly different at all times of observation”. This information has been provided at the end of the Results section (page 10, lines 20-22). That “Owing to the programme’s success, the meaning of different hand disinfection compliance rates before and after patient contact and how this may have affected P. aeruginosa circulation in the ward were not further investigated” has been also explained in the Discussion section (page 13, lanes 24-25, and page 14, lanes 1-2).