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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed a revised version of our manuscript along with the answers to the two reviewers’ comments which lead us to improve our manuscript. Herein, our answers are in bold.

Reviewer #1’s report
Reviewer: Eija Könönen
- Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Unexpected or unusual presentations of a disease
- Do you believe the case report is authentic?: Yes
- Do you have any ethical concerns?: No
- Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?: Yes
- Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?: Yes
- Does the article report relevant patient information?: Yes
- Does the article report relevant physical examination findings?: Yes
- Does the article report important dates and times in this case?: Yes
- Does the article report the diagnostic assessments?: Yes
- Does the article report the types of intervention?: Yes
- Does the article report a summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits?: Yes
- If any information is missing from the reporting, please detail it here.: Yes
- Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?: Yes
- Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?: Yes
The authors report a rare involvement of *A. gerencseriae* in hip prosthesis infection. The case is interesting and the paper is well written. Worth of mentioning is also the advanced methodology, sequencing and MALDI-TOF, used for bacterial identification.

Some comments as follows:

**Introduction:** “…associated with cervicofacial infections [4] and dental diseases [9-11]…”

Note: osteoradionecrosis (ref #11) is hardly a dental disease

A: The reviewer is perfectly right: Line 54: “dental diseases [9-10], in case of osteoradionecrosis” had been added.

Instead of citing a publication, which is in French (ref #12, Annales de Dermatologie et de Vénéréologie; currently, there is the publisher’s name and journal’s name is missing), it would be more reader-friendly to cite a paper written in English (e.g., a recent review by Könönen&Wade)

A: As recommended, reference 12 had been updated for that proposed. In addition, sentence line 115 become: “Involvement in eye infections and chronic granumatoous diseases has also been reported [12].”

From the line 98 onwards, the species name is incorrectly written as A. *genrencseriae*

A: “A. gerencseriae” had been corrected line 101.

**Abstract:** periodontical diseases periodontal diseases

A: Periodontal had been corrected in abstract.

Fig. 1/the left column: ‘clincial isolate’ is repeatedly incorrectly written: clinical

A: “Clinical” replaces “clincial” in the Fig.2.

**Reviewer #2 report**  
Reviewer:Michelle Murray

- Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Other
An unusual bacteria associated with hip prosthesis

- Do you believe the case report is authentic?:

  Yes, I believe this is authors' work, however I am uncertain as to how original the case report is.

  A : Following reviewer n°1 comment and this remark, the reference 12 had been replaced by: Könönen E, Wade WG. 2015. Actinomyces and Related Organisms in Human Infections. Clin Microbiol Rev 28(2), 419-442. This comprehensive review dealing with Actinomyces infections supports how the case is original, as A. gerencseriae has never been previously involved in orthopedic devices infections.

- Do you have any ethical concerns?: No

- Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?:

  Yes, but english language and phrasing is a problem throughout lines 29,35,36,39,40.

  A: Line 29: “had been associated” replaces “are known as being responsible.”

  Line 36: “a fluid sampled from the collection” replaces “collection puncture”.

  Line 39: “adapted” replaces “adjusted”.

  Moreover, the revised version has been corrected by professional correctors.

Abbreviation MALDI should be written after matrix assisted laser desorption.

  A : As recommended MALDI-TOF had been added after -assisted laser desorption ionisation time-of-flight mass-spectrometry.

I am not sure I concur with authors that this is the first case, many written under previous name of actinomyces israelii.

- Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?:

  Again the reference to the first case report of micro organism needs to be addressed

- Does the article report relevant patient information?: Yes

- Does the article report relevant physical examination findings?: No

- Does the article report important dates and times in this case?: No

- Does the article report the diagnostic assessments?: No

- Does the article report the types of intervention?: No

- Does the article report a summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits?: No

- If any information is missing from the reporting, please detail it here.:

  English language deescription is a problem here. Procedures "collection puncture" were performed is this ? incision and drainage. It is not translated
correctly from french.
A : Line 70 : “an incision with drainage” replaces collection puncture.

Past medical history- interpretation is difficult due to grammar and translation - coxarthrosis ?? osteoarthritis heart attacks= myocardial infarction is correct term ICD- implantable cardiac defibrillator anti- Vit K treatment ?? warfarin and the clinical course that follows becomes difficult to understand because of the translation. ?
A : Line 59 : Coxarthrosis was replaced by osteoarthritis.
Line 61 : myocardial infarction replaces heart attack.
Line 62 : “an implantable cardiac defibrillator” (ICD) replaces “defibrillator”.
Line 63 : warfarin replaces “anti-vitamine K”

Is it necessary to include WCC and neutrophil values without referencing whether they are normal or abnormal.
A : Line 74 : “was normal” was added.

- Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?:
Case is not divided into a discussion box
are lines 76-92 required?? do not help with understanding and reading of case
line 74- describe what columbia agar is (the environment is not necessary to describe) and what cultures on this agar
A : Line 77 : “with 5% sheep blood” was added to clarify what Columbia agar is.
line 76 - describe use of MALDI
A : Line 79 : “that allows bacterial identification through mass spectra” had been added.

English again hampers interpretation "puncture product"- fluid sampled etc
A : Line 89 : “Fluid sampled” replaces “puncture product”.

Not sure if I completely concur with authors that only reason for not growing is that it requires 16sRNA seq
A : As precised line 80, “identification of the second colony failed.” Indeed, bacteria grew but MALDI-TOF identification failed and identification was eventually done by using 16S DNA sequencing.

- Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?:
Not necessarily, there are many case reports already published in the area under previous name actinomyces israelii, this should be referenced and then interest value of the case report should be relooked at.
A : Actinomyces gerencseriae was already known as the serovar II of Actinomyces israelii, as specified line 31. To support the originality of the case report, reference 12 had been updated.
Main issue: English translation is poor in parts and more references should be included and refer previous work in the area.

A: As required reference 12 was updated for a comprehensive review:

Are other more relevant figures available in this case?

- Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
- Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
  A: The revised version has been corrected by professional correctors.

- Declaration of competing interests: No

As the authors answered all the two reviewers’ remarks and corrected the manuscript accordingly, they hope that this revised version will be accepted for publication.

Yours sincerely,

Prof. Michel DRANCOURT

Corresponding author