

Author Response for Manuscript #71285

We wish to thank both reviewers for their time reviewing our paper.

Reviewer #1

You wrote that our paper was well written, and thank you for your response.

Reviewer #2

You wrote that our paper's experimental methods were too simple to determine the reliability of the results.

For the biofilm assays, we outlined the strains that were used, including a negative control strain (the *srtA* mutant) and the positive control strain represented by the wild-type *S. aureus* Newman strain. A description of the procedure was clearly written. The assays were done five times, each time in triplicate. Thus, the methodology, controls, and number of replicates were laid out for the reader. Our results demonstrated that a mutation in either the *brpS* or *brpR* gene significantly affected biofilm formation.

For the quantitative real-time-polymerase chain reaction assays, we described the procedure that was done, the primers that were used, the PCR conditions for the amplifications, and the controls that were used. The number of replicates was also described. Our results demonstrate that a mutation in the *brpS* gene affected transcription of some key genes that encode proteins needed for proper biofilm formation.

For the bioinformatic analysis, we outlined the bioinformatic tools that are available. Clearly, the BrpR and BrpS proteins have a high degree of homology with streptococcal proteins tied to late-stage competence.

All of the methods were clearly described and the results match what we discussed in the paper.