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Which of the following following best describes what type of case report this is?: Unexpected or unusual presentations of a disease

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

Does the case report have explanatory value?: No

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: Yes

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: No

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

The case report is well written and convincing.

A slight drawback is that culture of the organism and PCR were performed from the same specimen. With fastidious or opportunistic microorganisms ideally you would wish isolation or detection by other means in at least two independent specimens. This limitation should be mentioned.

Disk susceptibility testing is not adequate for Abiotrophia sp. as they are fastidious organisms. MIC testing, e.g. E-Test or broth micro dilution with supplemented media, is necessary and MICs for the relevant antibiotics should be explicitly stated.

Authors should briefly describe the content of the Arthritis kit, as readers may not wish to consult another paper for that.
CRP at the time of diagnosis and white cell count should be explicitly stated and compared to the same parameters after successful therapy.

In different countries BACTEC blood culture bottles may have slightly different names, however, on the web Bactec1Plus Aerobic/F and Bactec1 Lytic/10 Anaerobic/F bottles are referred to as Bactec Plus Aerobic/F and Bactec Lytic/10 Anaerobic/F. Please confirm that name is correct.
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