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Dear Editor,

we would like to thank the editors and the reviewers for the comments they provided. They all have been taken in consideration, and helped us to improve substantially the manuscript and overcome the limits of the first version. Our answers are now given below for each of the comments/questions in a point-by-point manner, and accordingly in the paper. We are sure that the paper has been considerably ameliorated and hope that these corrections will be sufficient to fulfill the requests.

Sincerely yours,

Maia De Luca on behalf of all the co-authors

Reviewer 1

Major Comments

“Introduction
1. I believe that Introduction should include the following three short paragraphs:
   - Granulicatella spp.: characteristics of the microorganism and difficulties in identifying it, clinical presentation and concerns about the antibiotic therapy.
   - Endocarditis in children: briefly the main epidemiological and clinical features, and data on the outcome.
   - Presentation of own work.”

Answer: We have considered the interesting comments and modified the introduction according to reviewer’s indication. We divided the introduction into three paragraphs and added informations both on the clinical and therapeutical characteristics of granulicatella spp. and on the epidemiological/clinical features of endocarditis in children.

“Discussion
2. The strength of the article is the failure of the first-line therapy and the good response observed after starting meropenem associated to other antibiotics. I believe authors should point out this in the first paragraph of their discussion. A literature review should be done to search if other authors found the same difficulties in the treatment of Granulicatella spp. endocarditis and observed a good response to meropenem. The role of surgery in the good outcome of the first patient should be also discuss.”
Answer: We have taken carefully the criticism of the reviewer.
- First of all we underlined the good response to meropenem in the first paragraph;
- We pointed out in the text the result of literature review about treatment of Granulicatella spp. endocarditis and in particular treatment with meropenem: “To our knowledge this is the first description of *Granulicatella* spp bacteraemia successfully treated with a combined therapy including meropenem.”
- We discussed the role of surgery in the good outcome of the first patient.

**Minor comments**

3. **Germ should be change with microorganism**

   Answer: We corrected the text

4. **References should be indicated for data on epidemiology and outcome of NVS endocarditis, and for those on endocarditis in children.**

   Answer: We added references.

5. **In haemoglobin and CRP comma should be replaced by point**

   Answer: We corrected the text

6. **Genus and species of microrganisms should be always written in italics.**

   Answer: We corrected the typing mistake

**Reviewer 2**

**Minor essential revisions**

1: “The manuscript does not contain the references.”

   Answer: We added references

2: “The microorganisms’ name should be in italics.”

   Answer: “We corrected the typing mistake”