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Point by point response to comments and questions from reviewers

Reviewer reports:

1. Jaydip Ray (Reviewer 1): a Relevant study on pathogens and sensitivity in a medium sized well characterized population of OME patients.

2. Müzeyyen Doğan (Reviewer 2): Dear author. This manuscript was well written but does not contain new and significant information to justify publication in ENT journal. It contains demographic data so that journals about public health may be more relevant than ENT journals. Sincerely yours.

As the main objective of this study was isolating etiologic pathogens from middle ear infection of pediatric patients and assessing the antibiogram, therefore a journal which is concerned about ear pathology is suit for publication. Accordingly, this journal is more appropriate for this article than other journals.
3. Yakup Yegin (Reviewer 3):
   
a. You should update the references

   The reference section is updated with the addition of new and recent references. As well the referencing style is checked for each reference for its consistence with BMC guideline and with each other. Accordingly, thirteen new references were added in the revised version of which eleven of them are articles published from 2014-2017.

b. limitations of the present study are required to discuss well

   The limitation of the current study was addressed well in different areas of the discussion. In addition, the strength and limitation were added as new section next to discussion.

   The present study is required to be improved.

1- Please add the ethical committee number.

   The ethical approval number was added next to the funding organization in the online format.

2-It is not clear if the study was prospective or retrospective

   We have indicated that the study was a prospective cross-sectional study on the title.

3-The need for such a study should be mentioned in the background.

   The justification or the need for this study was well-explained in the background section and indicated by track change and highlighting.

4- Discussion should be improved with current literature.
The discussion part is updated with the addition of new and recent literatures. Accordingly, thirteen new literatures were added in the revised version of which eleven of them are articles published from 2014-2017.

5- Strength and limitations of the present study should be specified in the discussion.

The limitation of the current study was addressed well in different areas of the discussion. In addition, the strength and limitation were added as new section next to discussion.

6- References style is confusing. Please correct the references due to our journal guideline. For ex; references 10,11..

The referencing style is checked for each reference for its consistence with BMC guideline and with each other.

7-References should be enriched with the previous important studies.

The reference section is updated with the addition of new and recent references. Accordingly, thirteen new references were added in the revised version of which eleven of them are articles published from 2014-2017.