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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor

First of all, we would like to acknowledge your work and reviewer’s comments to make this manuscript better. We took these comments very seriously and revised our manuscript according to reviewer’s comments one by one.

The newly added parts were highlighted in light green. This version of manuscript is the final clean file, so that the marks of the tracked changes were not displayed.
The following below is our detailed point to point revision.

Reviewer's comment:

1- Please remember not to write spp. or sp. in italics; correct this throughout the entire manuscript.

Response:
We corrected all the “spp.” in normal font throughout the entire manuscript.

2- Please, delete Pseudomonas aeruginosa from the study as this microorganism is naturally resistant to tetracyclines.

Response:
We deleted all the Pseudomonas aeruginosa from the study.

3- Lines 129 to 133: This information should be expanded including specific values of MIC according to the categories of resistance. Also the information regarding the number of isolates with NDM or kpc is missing and also their MIC values. I would suggest to include it as a new category in the tables.

- Line 129: Specify also the MIC50 and 90 values for those antimicrobials here.

Response:
This section was rewritten. We divided the Carbapenem-resistant Klebsiella pneumoniae into 2 groups kpc-2 positive and NDM-1 positive. We also compared the MIC50 and MIC90 of eravacycline against strains with different resistance mechanisms.

4- -Lines 143 to 150: Again, if you are comparing MIC values, it would be appreciated to include the MIC for this antimicrobials also in the text when cited.

Response:
We added the MIC values in this section.
5- What about the results regarding the susceptibility to eravacycline in S. maltophilia? As they are only represented in the dotplot, should also be cited in the text.

Response:

For S. maltophilia there is no breakpoints available for tigecycline and eravacycline. We added a paragraph to compare the MIC50 and MIC90 of tigecycline and eravacycline against S. maltophilia.

6- Lines 227 to 230: Are you talking about patients treated with or about isolates tested?

Response:

We want to describe the isolates tested. In order to avoid any ambiguity, we rewrote the whole sentence.

7- Table 1: Delete P. aeruginosa (you didn't test it, right?). S. maltophilia instead P. maltophilia

Response:

We deleted the P. aeruginosa in Table 1 and replaced the P. maltophilia with S. maltophilia.

8- Lines 227 to 230: Are you talking about patients treated with or about isolates tested?

Response:

We want to describe the isolates tested. In order to avoid any ambiguity, we rewrote the whole sentence.

9- Table 2 and 3: I would suggest to split the carbapenem category according to the type of carbapenemase (if identified). It would be interesting to know if there are differences on the activity of eravacycline according to the type of carbapenemase. When you refer to "without resistance gene", what you mean? Clarify if you are referring only to acquired beta lactamases or if you are talking about other type of mechanisms of resistance.

Table 4: Same comments to the "without resistance gene" column

Response:
The results of E. coli and E. cloacae were summarized in Table 2. We have identified the types of carbapenemase for E. coli but this identification was not performed for E. cloacae. We did not make any changes to Table 2. Table 3 described the only K. pneumoniae of different resistance characteristics. We changed the table according to reviewer’s suggestion.

We have changed "without resistance gene" to "sensitive" and added a footnote to the tables which contains sensitive strains.

The above is the point to point revision. Once again, thanks to the hard work of editor and reviewers, we also learned a great deal of Eravacycline from the process of revising this manuscript.

Best regards

Hui Wang

Department of Clinical Laboratory
Peking University People’s Hospital
Beijing, 100044
China
Tel: 86-10-88326300
Email: whuibj@163.com