



**Open Access** This file is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. In the cases where the authors are anonymous, such as is the case for the reports of anonymous peer reviewers, author attribution should be to 'Anonymous Referee' followed by a clear attribution to the source work. The images or other third party material in this file are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

REVIEWERS' COMMENTS:

Reviewer #1 (Remarks to the Author):

The authors have provided a revised version of their article.  
The clarity of the manuscript has been improved considerably.  
All my comments were sufficiently addressed.  
I have no additional comments.

A 16<sup>th</sup> Century *Escherichia coli* draft genome associated with an  
opportunistic bile infection:  
Second Round of Reviews

George S. Long<sup>1,2,\*†</sup>, Jennifer Klunk<sup>1,2,3,\*</sup>, Ana T. Duggan<sup>2,4</sup>, Madeline Tapson<sup>2,3</sup>,  
Valentina Giuffra<sup>5</sup>, Lavinia Gazzè<sup>6</sup>, Antonio Fornaciari<sup>7</sup>, Sebastian Duchene<sup>8</sup>,  
Gino Fornaciari<sup>7</sup>, Olivier Clermont<sup>9</sup>, Erick Denamur<sup>9,10,†</sup>,  
G. Brian Golding<sup>1</sup>, Hendrik Poinar<sup>2,11,†</sup>

April 4, 2022

Comments from the second round of review at Communications Biology. Responses are coloured red.

## Reviewer 1

The authors have provided a revised version of their article.  
The clarity of the manuscript has been improved considerably.  
All my comments were sufficiently addressed.  
I have no additional comments.

We'd like to thank for Reviewer 1 for taking the time to ensure that we addressed their previous concerns. We are glad that the message of the manuscript is clearer than it was during our initial submission.