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To,
The Editor
BMC Public Health

Subject: Submission of the revised manuscript “Antibiotics and antibiotic-resistant bacteria in waters associated with a hospital in Ujjain, India.” (Vishal Diwan et al).
(MS: 1081578955308604)

Dear Sir/Madam,

We are thankful for the valuable and interesting comments given by the two reviewers and the editor. We have revised the manuscript accordingly. The action taken is reported below. For easy reading we repeat the comments by the reviewers and the editor in bold letters and then make our comments in plain text. Changes made in MS in underlined.

In addition, some editing of the manuscript has been done to accommodate the new material added as per the suggestions of reviewers and to conform to the journal style. Reference no 10, 15, 16,17 are new addition as it was necessary after revision. Reference 19 has replaced by reference 16.

Reviewer's report 1

This is a nice manuscript, relatively well written and conceived: Thank you

Major compulsory revision:

- But, in terms of description of the analytical methodology it lacks on adherence to the good rules, which is a sign of low knowledge level in the field. The author should look for assistance by a more experience person in the subject of analytical determination of traces of pharmaceuticals with the aid of LC-MS/MS.

  Thank you very much for your important comments on the methodological aspect of antibiotics determination presented in this study. Our analytical chemists from SIIR, as per requirements, have revised and rewritten the chemical part in detail. (Page 7)

- Even the abbreviation of the method is wrong written. All the names should be harmonized. The citation of the fabricant (city, country) of the reagents and equipments are missing. There is no LOQ in Table 1.

  All the abbreviations in the method are now standardized. All the names are
harmonized. The citations of the fabricants (city, country), reagents and equipments are given now. LOQ is also added.

- **Some parameters of validation are out of limits (e.g. 70 and 116%)**
The values have been corrected as in Table 3 (page 24).

- **Table 2 should be divided in two: one for the ionization source parameters (including temperature!) and the other for the mass spectrometer data (including entrance and declustering potential, collision energy and cell exit potential)**

  Table 2 is made into two and all mass spectrometric conditions have been included. Entrance and declustering potential and cell exit potential are not required in the instrument used (page 22 and 23)

- **Table 4: the unit is given twice, at the title and on the bottom:**

  This table is now changed to table 5. The duplication of unit given is now corrected. (page 26)

- **Where are the retention times of tables 1 and 2?**
  Retention time is now added.

- **Which was the mobile phase Used Column, run time?** Added

- **There are so many analytical questions that this manuscript should be refused in the present form. It should be rewritten with the aid of an analytical chemist, expert in LC-MS/MS determination of traces of pharmaceuticals. If necessary, additional data should be given/produced**

  Based on referee’s comments, we have now rewritten and revised the analytical method for the analysis of antibiotics in detail and included all the comments suggested by referee.

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

- **Quality of written English: Acceptable**
Reviewer's report: 2

Major compulsory revision:

- I suggest no major compulsory revisions
  Thank you

For minor revisions

- I suggest adding more details in the methods on how samples were processed to detect E. coli.
  We have now revised and described in detail method for processing and detection of E.coli. (Page 10).

- In the discussion, the authors should discuss the need for sampling over several days
  Yes. Added (last paragraph page 14).

- And using non-culture techniques in future studies.
  Thank you very much for this comment. We agree that use of non culture techniques is important in these studies, however, due to limited resources we could not use these technique, though we plan to use these in future studies (first paragraph page 16)

- They might also highlight the unique aspects of their study
  The unique aspect of this study is highlighted in the first paragraph and also in last paragraph of the discussion.

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

- Quality of written English: Acceptable

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

- Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests

I hope that the two referees and the editors will be satisfied with our response and accept the paper, so it can be published in the journal soon.

Thanks and Regards

Vishal Diwan
Post Doctoral Fellow and Corresponding Author
Division of Global Health, (IHCAR), Department of Public Health Sciences, Karolinska Institutet, Nobels väg 9, SE 17177, Stockholm, Sweden
Email: vishaldiwan@hotmail.com