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Author’s response to reviews: see over
Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for forwarding the reviewers comments concerning our manuscript "Keratitis by *Fusarium temperatum*, a novel opportunist" (MS: 1930636285131411). Kindly note that all reviewers’ comments were considered and the manuscript has been modified:

Response to Editorial Requirements:

1. Figure legends must be included in the main manuscript text file at the end of the document, rather than being a part of the figure file. For each figure, the following information should be provided: Figure number (in sequence, using Arabic numerals - i.e. Figure 1, 2, 3 etc); short title of figure (maximum 15 words); detailed legend, up to 300 words.

Response: All figure legends included in the main manuscript text file at the end of the document (they are in sequences using Arabic numerals with short title).

2. Please note that it is the responsibility of the author(s) to obtain permission from the copyright holder to reproduce figures or tables that have previously been published elsewhere.

Response: An email was sent to the author to obtain the permission from the copyright holder to produce part of the table that previously been published in *Mycologia*

Dear Jonathan

Recently we got a case of *Fusarium temperatum* from eye infection in a patient from Mexico. We have already identified the agent as *F. temperatum* by sequencing and we used your article (31-Scauflaire J, Gourgue M, Munaut F: *Fusarium temperatum* sp. nov. from maize, an emergent species closely related to *Fusarium subglutinans*. *Mycologia* 2011, 103: 586–597) for helping us in the identification.

Also we used some of the sequences which you have already used in your article retrieving them from GenBank for Beta tubulin and TEF 1 alpha to make phylogenetic analysis. Now I would like to obtain your permission in order to publish this article. See the table. I would like to submit this case report to a medical journals but before that I need your permission. The journal asking me to get your permission if possible

I would like to use these data in order to make a small tree for identifying the causative agent.

Looking forward to hearing from you soon.

Best regards,

Abdullah Al-Hatmi, Medical mycologist

CBS- KNAW, Utrecht
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>collection</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>β -tubulin</th>
<th>TEF 1α</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>F. verticillioides</em></td>
<td>NRRL 22172</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>U34413</td>
<td>AF160262</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F. napiforme</em></td>
<td>NRRL 13604</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>U34428</td>
<td>AF160266</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F. nygamai</em></td>
<td>NRRL 13448</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>U34426</td>
<td>AF160273</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F. acutatum</em></td>
<td>NRRL 13308</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>U34431</td>
<td>AF160276</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F. phyllophilum</em></td>
<td>NRRL 13617</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>U34432</td>
<td>AF160274</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F. subglutinans</em></td>
<td>NRRL 22016</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>U34417</td>
<td>AF160289</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F. subglutinans</em></td>
<td>MUCL 52468</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>HM067699</td>
<td>HM067691</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F. circinatum</em></td>
<td>NRRL 25331</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>U61547</td>
<td>AF160295</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F. bulbicola</em></td>
<td>NRRL 13618</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>U61546</td>
<td>AF160294</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F. anthophilum</em></td>
<td>NRRL 13602</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>U61541</td>
<td>AF160292</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F. succisae</em></td>
<td>NRRL 13613</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>U34419</td>
<td>AF160291</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F. temperatum</em></td>
<td>MUCL 52450</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>HM067695</td>
<td>HM067687</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F. temperatum</em></td>
<td>MUCL 52436</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>HM067692</td>
<td>HM067684</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F. temperatum</em></td>
<td>MUCL 52443</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>HM067693</td>
<td>HM067685</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F. temperatum</em></td>
<td>MUCL 52450</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>HM067695</td>
<td>HM067687</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F. sterilihyphosum</em></td>
<td>CML 283</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>DQ445780</td>
<td>DQ452858</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F. konzum</em></td>
<td>MRC 8544</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>EU220234</td>
<td>EU220235</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F. ananatum</em></td>
<td>NRRL 22945</td>
<td>England</td>
<td>U34420</td>
<td>AF160297</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F. oxyspirum</em></td>
<td>NRRL 22902</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>U34424</td>
<td>AF160312</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F. temperatum</em></td>
<td>CBS135540</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>KP956084</td>
<td>KP956080</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response from the copyright holder to our email ensuring their permission to use the data

Dear Abdullah,

Yes, you have my permission to use sequence data and publish this interesting case of fungal infection. Please note that you mentioned twice *F. temperatum* MUCL52450 in the table.

Best regards, Jonathan
Reviewer #1:

Reviewer's report:

This article is interesting as it describes a quite rare causative agent of fungal keratitis in humans. In it, it is very well described the natural ecological niche and the way in which the infection occurs. Authors emphasize the importance of the molecular methods as a help for the identification of such agents, and also accurately describe the morphology and taxonomic analysis of the new species of fungal keratitis.

As a result of the review, there can be found minor essential revisions that are listed below, in eight segments. It is my suggestion to publish the article, considering mentioned minor corrections.

1) Abstract
Row 43: unnecessary dot/full stop: Abstract.
Response: the dot/full stop was removed.
Row 48: unnecessary space: and immunosuppression.
Response: unnecessary space was removed.

2) Background
Row 74: comma instead of dot: scale. Fusariosis
Response: the comma was added instead dot.

3) Case report
Row 108: Figure 1A instead of Fig.1A
Response: Figure IA was added.
Row 110: Figure 1A instead of Fig.1A
Response: Figure IA was added.
Row 184: Add the name of the document: the CLSI broth microdilution method, M38-A2
Response: The name of the document: the CLSI broth microdilution method M38-A2 was added.

4) Results
Row 206: Figure 1C instead of Fig.1C and the same in the text (see rows 206 – 217, row 303)
Response: All the terms Fig. were changed into Figure in all the text from row 206 to row 303.

Row 319: natamycin instead of the NAT
Response: NAT was changed into natamycin

5) Abbreviation
Row 336: Add: NATA: natamycin
Response: NATA: natamycin was added.

6) References
Response: the reference was corrected according to the reviewer’s comment.
Row 393: 355-361 instead of 355-61
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Row 394: Galarreta DJ, Tuft SJ, Ramsay , instead of Galarreta DJ; Tuft SJ; Ramsay A;
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Row 395: 1082-1086 instead of 1082-6
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Row 397: 773-776 instead of 773-6
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Row 399: 741-754 instead of 741-54
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Row 402: 1051-1053 instead of 1051-3
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Row 404: 207-209 instead of 207-9
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Row 406: 410-416 instead of 410-6
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Row 409: Br J Ophtalmol instead of Br. J. Ophtalmol
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Row 413: Jain PK, Gupta VK, … instead of P.K. Jain, V.K. Gupta…
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Row 419: 257-262 instead of 257-62
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Row 454: Knogge W: Fungal infection of plants. The Plant Cell 1996, instead of
Knogge, W: Fungal infection of plants. The Plant Cell, 1996,
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Row 455: Geiser D,… instead of Geiser, D, …
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Row 463: Smith SN: instead of Smith, S.N:
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Row 466: Coulumbe RA: biological action of mycotoxins. J Dairy instead of
Coulumbe, R.A: biological action of mycotoxins. J. Dairy
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Row 470: Mehl HL, Epstein L: instead of Mehl, H.L., Epstein, L:
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Row 480: Infect Immun instead of Infect. Immun
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Row 487: Add the year of publication!
Row 488: Marasas WFO, Rheeder JP, … instead of Marasas, W.F.O.; Rheeder, J.P.; …
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Row 502: Van Baarlen P, Van Belkum A, Summerbell R, Crous PW, and instead of van Baarlen, van Belkum, Summerbell R, Crous P.W, and
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Row 513: Paphitou N, instead of Paphitou, N,
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
7) Tables
Table 1 MIC values of clinical isolate Fusarium temperatum, CBS135540 instead of Table1- MICs values of clinical isolate (mg/liter)a
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Drug instead of CBS no
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
MIC values (mg/l) instead of 135540
Table 2 PCR primers used for amplification … instead of Table2-PCR primers used for amplification …
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
Table 3 Strain features and GenBank instead of Table3-Strain features and GenBank
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
See in the Table 3: F. ananatum instead of F.ananatum
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
8) Additional files
Growth of the isolate F. temperatum on OA, instead of Growth of the isolate F.temperatum on OA,
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
with false heads; (G). instead of with false heads;(G).
Response: correction was done according to the reviewer’s comment
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
Reviewer #2:

Reviewer's report:

Interesting case report. I have no comments on methodology - clear proof of causative relationship.

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.
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