Reviewer’s report

Title: In vitro Activities of Eravacycline against 336 Isolates Collected from 2012 to 2016 from 11 Teaching Hospitals in China

Version: 2 Date: 10 Apr 2019

Reviewer: Reviewer 2

Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses one or several testable research questions? (Brief or other article types: is there a clear objective?)

Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with sufficient technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

Yes - experiments and analyses were performed appropriately

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

N/A - there are no statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

Yes - the author's interpretation is reasonable
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Has the author addressed your concerns sufficiently for you to now recommend the work as a technically sound contribution? If not, can further revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: Authors have responded adequately to my questions and have made the suggested changes in the manuscript. Overall, the manuscript has improved its quality, however there are still some issues that should be addressed.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Some new suggestions have arisen after reading the new version:

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

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

Results section:

-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.

-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.

-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.

Discussion:

-Lines 227 to 230: Are you talking about patients treated with or about isolates tested??
Table 1: Delete P. aeruginosa (you didn't tested it, right?). S. maltophilia instead P. maltophilia

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 betalactamases or if you are talking about other type of mechanisms of resistance.

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

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

None

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:
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