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Reviewer's report:


This case report describes an endophthalmitis following pterygium surgery by Serratia marcescens. Overall, the manuscript was very well written. No serious issues were noted other than references could be improved.

Comments:

1. Genus and species should always be italicized.


3. Page 5, line 22-27. Please report MIC values of the Serratia marcescens isolate if they are available (for ceftazidime, moxifloxacin and gentamycin if possible).

4. Page 5, Please report whether the S. marcescens isolate was pigmented or not pigmented, as this can give some insight into its source. Pigmented tend to be environmental isolates. A brief description of how the bacteria was speciated should be included.

5. Page 5, line 50. Reference 11, is OK to include, but another more general reference about S. marcescens should be given. I suggest the excellent review by Mahlen (2011, Clinical Microbiology Reviews).

6. Page 7. A reference regarding the "devastating visual prognosis" of S. marcescens endophthalmitis should be included.

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

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

Unable to assess

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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