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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
1. The English need improvement since there are few grammatical and syntax errors in the manuscript (For example, the words “pathogenic” may be as “the pathogenic”; “final” as “a final”; “of top” as “of the top”; “necrosis” as “the necrosis”; “infections any” as “infections of any”; “culture-independent” as “a culture-independent”; “of they” as “they”; “that use” as “that the use”; “has potential” as “has the potential”). The grammar mistakes which are not mentioned here also to be checked and corrected properly. 2. There are some typing mistakes as well, and authors are advised to carefully proof-read the text (For example, the words “genomic sequence” may be as “genomic sequences”; “times, or” as “times or”; “years-old” as “years old”; “hallmarks” as “hallmark”; “condition,” as “condition”; “bone forming” as “bone-forming”; “false negative” as “false-negative”; “osteonecrosis,” as “osteonecrosis”). The typos not mentioned here also to be checked and corrected properly. 3. The genus name should be given completely when first time appear (“M. tuberculosis; Pseudomonas aeruginosa”) in the abstract, results part and followed by only the first letter (“M. tuberculosis; P. aeruginosa”). 4. Reference should be given for the standard protocol in the materials and methods section. If the authors are used the modified procedure may also be given in the materials and methods section. The references should also be included in the back-references. 5. In the statistical analysis the authors should also included USA along with “NY”. 6. In the results, the authors may include the percentage also with the numbers of individuals with different diagnosis. 7. Results needs to be revised with a clear presentation of the findings in a more scientific way. 8. The authors may improve the discussion of their work by focusing on the present findings and
introducing other authors who also worked with the same or other studies with recent references shortly. 9. The authors have uploaded “Biostatistics Review Certificate” instead of “Clinical Trial Registration Statement”. Similarly, the certificate of “Institutional Review Board Approval Form or Document” has been uploaded instead of “Non-Native Speakers of English Editing Certificate”. This should be properly checked and uploaded with the respective files. 10. The authors have not properly included the table, figures and supplementary file along with the manuscript. It should also be included along with the manuscript. Without table and figures it is difficult to understand the results. Hence, it should be included properly.
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### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Can't seem to have access to the figures and tables! I'd really like to check the raw data from metagenomic analysis.