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Reviewer's report:

We read with great interest the manuscript for the paper entitled "Eradication of P. aeruginosa Biofilm in Endotracheal Tubes Based on Lock Therapy: Results from an in Vitro Study", and below are our comments:

1. Abstract:
   a. Background:

   VAP- should be replaced by ventilator associated pneumonia

   b. Methods & Results:
   CFU/ml- should be replaced by colony count

   c. Results:
   "%" should be used after the numbers: ex. 5302% and 91.5%

2. Background:
   a. Line 32-sentence not clear

   b. Line 49-remove ";"

3. Conclusion:
   a. Line 56-change sentence structure
4. Analysis of colony counts and live cells in the sonicate:

a. 3 images were used only. Is this number enough for analysis?

5. In Figures 2 and 3 the authors need to explain the figure in detail in the caption.

6. The methods are not referenced. Are they all in-house?

7. Specifications needed by CLSM and SEM should be mentioned and the morphological findings by SEM should be also addressed and further analyzed.

8. The authors used SLT as a control; however, since the ETTs were subjected to cutting and freezing, this might have disrupted the biofilm, thus a control with bacterial culture grown on ETT without any treatment should be used along with this study to further support the findings.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript
Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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