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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Editors,

We have revised the manuscript according to the requirements of reviewers. We have checked usage of English in our manuscript. We thank the reviewers and editors for the effort and hope this revision can satisfy your request.

comments from reviewer 1:
Major Compulsory Revisions

1. This is a retrospective study evaluating fluoroquinolone resistance in bacteremic low-risk febrile neutropenic cancer patients. It has been conducted in two cancer centers: Shanghai Cancer Center, Fudan University, and Cancer Center, The Affiliated Hospital of Qingdao University Medical College. Authors reported that independent ethics committees at the Shanghai Cancer Center of Fudan University approved this study, but did not mention the ethics committees of the other Cancer Center. The protocol should be reviewed and approved by ethics committees of both centers.

We have added the statement about the approval of this study by the participating center. The authors mistakenly only provided the approval for one center in the original version.

2. In a very recent publication, Yang and colleagues reported results from a prospective pilot study evaluating safety and efficacy of once-daily, oral levofloxacin monotherapy in Chinese patients with low-risk febrile neutropenia. [He L, Zhou C, Zhao S, Weng H, Yang G. Once-daily, oral levofloxacin monotherapy for low-risk neutropenic fever in cancer patients: a pilot study in China. Anticancer Drugs. 2014 Dec 6.] In this study, the treatment was effective and well tolerated in 97.6% of patients irrespective of the cancer type and cause of fever. As the study population is apparently very similar but results are conflicting, please discuss any possible explanation.

We have added relevant discussion for this paper on page 13. This paper has also be listed in the references. We are grateful to your valuable suggestion.
comments from reviewer 2

Major Compulsory Revisions: NONE
Minor Essential Revisions
Only minor revisions: line 15 presented instead of presently
line 40 and 87: increasing prevalence recently (prevalently?)
line 119: they were
line 146: day 11 and 14 since the activation of the first
187-89: specify better

We have corrected all misused English vocabularies. We thank you for your patience.