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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Presentations, diagnoses and/or management of new and emerging diseases

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?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: Yes

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

general comments: this is an interesting case report underlining the clinical relevance of previously uncultured bacteria.

minor revisions:

line 36: it should be spelt "Pseudoclavibacter-like".

line 51: please insert "the" before "right leg".

line 63-70: do you have any explanations for the discrepancy of the microscopic and the culture results of the subcutaneous swab specimen? Was the Staphylococcus aureus isolate previously found in the wound susceptible to clindamycin? Have you performed a broad-range PCR directly from the subcutaneous swab and if so, was there a mixed signal of the electropherogram
indicating the presence of more than one microorganism in the wound?

line 72: if available, I would report the minimal inhibitory concentrations of the antibiotics tested. Why did you consider clindamycin and metronidazole resistant?
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