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Author's response to reviews: see over
Responses to the The CS Editorial comments:

- Please restructure the Abstract into the following three sections: Introduction, Case presentation, and Conclusion. The abstract should be no longer than 350 words. 
  
  *Introduction:* An introduction about why this case is important and needs to be reported. Please include information on whether this is the first report of this kind in the literature.
  
  *Case presentation:* Brief details of what the patient presented with, including the patient's age, sex and ethnic background.
  
  *Conclusion:* A brief conclusion of what the reader should learn from the case report and what the clinical impact will be. Is it an original case report of interest to a particular clinical speciality of medicine or will it have a broader clinical impact across medicine? Please include information on how it will significantly advance our knowledge of a particular disease etiology or drug mechanism.
  
  *R: Done*

- Please include a competing interests section at the end of the manuscript, before the reference list. If the authors have no competing interests, please state: "The authors declare that they have no competing interests."
  
  *R: Done –highlighted*

- Please include the authors contribution section. We suggest the following kind of format (please use initials to refer to each author's contribution): FC analyzed and interpreted the patient data regarding the hematological disease and the transplant. RH performed the histological examination of the kidney, and was a major contributor in writing the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.
  
  *R: Done-highlighted on first page*

- We feel that it is not necessary to explicitly state that the patient is a sculptor and, in the interests of protecting the patient's identity, we think this could be re-phrased to state that 'in a professional capacity the patient works with natural hair taken from live horses' or words to that effect. Please could you re-phrase sections where they have indicated the patient's profession.
  
  *R: Ok REWARDED, HIGHLIGHTED*

Rhodococcus Equi venous catheter infection: a case report and review

Authors: Guerrero R, Bhargava A, Nahleh Z

Responses to reviewers’s comments:

**REVIEWER # 1**

**Answers to Comments to authors:**

1. The authors should emphasize the points that make this case unique.

  *R*: emphasized, occurring in nontransplant, nonHIV patient, and caused by a central venous catheter “port” related bacteremia, not reported in literature

2. The clarity of the case can be improved by attention to grammatical and spelling errors through out. Standardize use of "catheter-related bloodstream infection."
R: Grammatical errors corrected. Use of “Central venous catheter” was adopted in the text.

3. Include information about laboratory tests for the patient, especially the WBC and differential. Consider adding photograph of the grams stain or colony growth on the plate.
R: WBC, labs info and investigations including fever workup included. Photo not available.

4. Add discussion of the fact the patient’s blood cultures may have been negative because of prior antibiotic treatment, especially vancomycin. List any other antibiotics she may have received prior to presentation.
R: prior therapy and possible reasons for detection failure were clarified.

5. The discussion of virulence factors and molecular mechanisms of virulence is important but not clearly written.
R: this has been revised in the discussion.

6. Rifampin is not a macrolide antibiotic.
R: clarified.

7. Include the resistance profile of the organism isolated in this patient and discuss why antibiotic regimen was selected.
R: done.

8. Infections in transplant patients are mentioned in the introduction but not further discussed. T cell dysfunction as a mechanism of increased risk for infection should be highlighted.
R: discussion about virulence of R equi and treatment in immunocompromised patients was expanded.

9. Authors state in the conclusion that two antibiotics are recommended after IV therapy, but that is not what they did for their patient, and this point is somewhat disputed. Would consider discussion of the literature supporting or refuting this approach.
R: this has been corrected and patient’s treatment revised.

REVIEWER #2

This article is poorly written with mistakes too numerous to point out each mistake.
R: mistakes corrected, manuscript was subject to major revisions and editing.

There is one issue I have concern with. The authors report an artist who uses horse hair in her sculpture. The authors then include 2 figures of horse hair sculptures. The spirit of HIPAA is potentially violated by including the figures. As such, I recommend they be removed.
R: pictures removed.