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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:

The Authors describe a case of Long Term Treatment with Daptomycin, Ceftazidime and Colistin in a Patient with a Poly-microbial, Multi-Drug-Resistant Prosthetic Joint Re-Infection.

General comments:

The case is well written and plenty of data are given. Tough issues are discussed such as combination treatment, microbiology and molecular methods from samples other than blood. Perhaps at the end of the paper one may wonder about another possibility: what about a positive Septifast result from with negative cultures?
Specific comments:
In the abstract section, it is not immediately understandable the duration of treatment with colistin, daptomycin and ceftazidime. The choice of ceftazidime and colistin is not usual and the reader has to read the entire paper to understand it. The use of “reliably” at the end of abstract may not be appropriate.

In the Introduction, at the end, I would not write directly “poly-microbial, multi-drug-resistant PJI re-infection”, since doing so the reader may not directly think to molecular methods and other features thoroughly presented in the report.

In the text:
Page 4: “colositin” should be changed to “colistin”
Please chose between “ceftazidime” and “ceftazidim”

Personal comments:
I do not like the expression “plus” (for example in the abstract and in the text).
At the end of the abstract “Our findings regarding the reported case suggest…” may be shortened to “our findings…suggest”.
I do not like numbers (1, 2, 3,) in the Introduction, although some of my mentors always did so.
In the text it, page 4 is not elegant to say “The pre-surgery sedimentation rate was 35 mm 1°h and C-reactive protein was not obtained”

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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