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Reviewer's report:

Dr. Nordholm and colleagues report an interesting case of Eikenella corrodens endocarditis and liver abscess.

Overall, the article is well written. However, in my opinion this case report should be reduced by, at least, half of its actual length.

My suggestions to improve this manuscript are the following:

1. Abstract: Conclusions: The authors state that Eikenella corrodens should be appropriately covering when dealing with the empiric treatment of liver abscesses. In my opinion, as Eikenella corrodens liver abscess is so uncommon (as the authors state in the discussion) and this bacterium is usually sensitive to betalactams and metronidazole (the standard of care for empiric treatment of liver abscess), I suggest to delete this statement.

2. Length of the text (combining background and discussion) should be reduced (around 15%).

3. References: 47 references are too many. I would suggest than 10-20 references should be enough for a case report.

4. Table 1 does not add value to the manuscript. I suggest to delete it.

5. Figures: 1 figure should be enough to illustrate the case. I personally like the PET scan. TEE does not add value. Figure 3 is summarize in the case description and I don't think is useful for the reader.
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