

Dear editors:

Thank you very much for your email that included the reviewer's report on our paper (NO.:63230, Case Report). We would also like to thank the reviewer for his constructive comments and valuable recommendations. We have carefully revised the manuscript according to the reviewer's suggestion.

Our responses to the reviewer's comments are listed below:

Reviewer #1:

This is an interesting paper describing a case of brucellosis initially misdiagnosed as a metastatic prostatic neoplasia. In the literature some cases of *Brucella* spp prostatitis and cases of vertebral osteomyelitis are described but this is the first case of involvement of both organs that led to an initial diagnostic error. The case is interesting and deserves publication. However, authors should avoid using the generic term of *Brucella* and use that of the isolated specie (*Brucella melitensis*? *B. suis*? *B. abortus*?) in blood cultures.

Response: We have consulted our colleagues in the department of bacteriological examination in our hospital, and they gave us feedback that our hospital does not carry out relevant tests for *Brucella* typing at present; therefore, we could not detect the species of *Brucella* that infected the patient. However, from the patient's past history and epidemiological studies in China, we could detect that he is more likely to be infected with *Brucella melitensis*.

In addition, we would like to revise the title of this article as "Rare case of brucellosis misdiagnosed as prostate carcinoma with lumbar vertebra metastasis: a case report".

We appreciate the editors' and reviewer's efforts, and hope that our revisions will meet with approval. Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.

Yours sincerely,
Jian-Di Yu