

Reply Letter to Reviewers

Subject: Submission of **Revised Manuscript Reference: #7574**

Article title: *"Investigations on microbiome of the used clinical device revealed many uncultivable newer bacterial species associated with persistent chronic infections".*

Reviewer C

Comment1 - The Introduction section is very long.

Answer: The introduction section is shortened now to reflect the current knowledge in the topic.

Modification done in Page numbers 1 & 2; line numbers 55 to 60. Page no 3; line number 65 to 72

Comment 2- In methodology section, the methods have not been described in an orderly and clear manner throughout the section. In addition, the units, symbols and spaces between them need to be carefully reviewed, as well as the data of the manufacturers of the material used.

Answer: the methods section has been re-written and orderly described with all the grammatical corrections incorporated. Spaces have been provided wherever required. Units, symbols and manufacturer's details of the materials used have been provided in the material section. See page numbers 3 to 10.

Comments 3 -The Results section and Tables should be carefully revised, as: some results were not presented (for example, the results of biofilm formation assays were not presented in the text) or not clearly presented; acronyms for medical devices were used, but they change throughout the text, making understanding difficult; Tables look unformatted; Table titles are not objective; the meaning of some acronyms were not provided in Table footnotes.

Answer: Results and Tables were thoroughly checked and revised appropriately. Biofilm results have been now incorporated in the manuscript text, see Page number- 10; Line numbers 222 to 224 and table 1, page number 27. Acronyms for medical devices have been provided clearly in the text and the footnotes of the table (see table 1 & 2; Page 27 and 28). Device sample IDs were changed only in case NGS performed samples. Even here the alternative/synonymous ID has been given in the table 2; page number 28.

Comment 4 - The references were not in accordance with the Vancouver format.

Answer: All the references were now in accordance with the Vancouver format

Comment 5 – The manuscript requires a thorough assessment of grammar and spelling

Answer: The manuscript has been thoroughly checked for the mistakes/ errors and now all the corrections have been incorporated

Reviewer D

Comment 1: I would like to suggest changing some keywords, to words that are not in the title and thus providing greater visibility of the article.

Answer: New keywords have been given as suggested by the reviewer. **See page number 1; line numbers 30 & 31**

Comment 2: Better reference for the introduction section and it contains lots of unreferenced text.

Answer: The introduction section is rewritten and new references have been cited that reflects the current knowledge in the field **See page numbers 2 & 3; line numbers 55 to 60; line numbers 65 to 72 (Reference numbers 6 & 7)**

Comment 3: Missing images, graphs or tables.

Answer: All the images, graphs and tables were either in the main manuscript or in the supplementary data

Comment 4: Use of impersonal language

Answer: the language has been corrected in the entire manuscript as suggested by the reviewer

Comment 4: Please highlight conclusions

Answer: Modified and highlighted important conclusions of the study as suggested by the reviewer; **see page number 19.**

Comment 5: References: Please check if all are in the journal's rules

Answer: All the references were included according to the journal's rules

Comment 6: Manuscript needs some language corrections

Answer: All the grammatical errors and language corrections have been incorporated in the manuscript text now

Comment 7

Main weaknesses of the manuscript - Missing images, graphs or tables. Better reference the introduction and lots of unreferenced text. Use impersonal language. Please check if all are in the journal's rules and highlight conclusions.

Answer: The introduction section is rewritten and new references have been cited that reflects the current knowledge in the field. **See page number 2; line numbers 48 to 49; line numbers 55 to 60 and line numbers 65 to 72 (Reference numbers included in reference section 1, 2,3 6 & 7).** All the unreferenced text has been referred with the cited reference now; **see new added references in the reference section; Page number 20.** Additional graphs and tables have been added for the work, **See supplementary file.** All the grammatical errors and language corrections have been thorough checked in the manuscript text now. Conclusions of the study have been highlighted now, **see page number 19.**

Reviewer E

Comment 1: The abstract is too long and covers an entire page. Please check the journals guideline and concise it accordingly

Answer: The abstract has been modified and it is more concise now. The write-up has now adhering to all the rules and guidelines of journal. Some paragraphs from abstract and introduction section have been removed to make it more concise; **see page numbers 1 to 3.**

Comment 2: The whole manuscript need to be proofread for grammatical corrections. The written manuscript text requires a thorough assessment of grammar and spelling

Answer: The work has been re-written with a thorough assessment of grammar and spelling and corrections were made as and when required