

July 5, 2021

Dear editor,

Please find attached files of revised manuscript in word format

**Title: Cefoperazone sodium/sulbactam sodium VS piperacillin sodium/tazobactam sodium in the treatment of respiratory tract infection in the elderly**

**Author:** Xiaoxia Wang, chengtai Ma, yanxia Jiang, yunjie Ge, fayun Liu, wengang Xu

**Name of Journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 66824

First of all, thank you for your careful guidance of this article. Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer:

**Reviewer: 06060832**

I have read with great interest the manuscript entitled "Cefoperazone sodium sulbactam sodium VS piperacillin sodium tazobactam sodium in the treatment of respiratory tract infection in the elderly". This study selects 74 elderly patients with respiratory tract infection in their hospital for grouping study, in order to determine the therapeutic value and safety of different antibiotics. The symptom relief time, treatment effect, laboratory indexes levels before and 7 days after treatment, and the incidence of adverse reactions were calculated between the two groups. Finally, they concluded that piperacillin sodium tazobactam sodium is better than cefoperazone sodium sulbactam sodium in the treatment of senile respiratory tract infection. It can effectively relieve clinical symptoms, down-regulate the contents of serum PCT, CRP and other factors, reduce the degree of inflammatory reaction, and has a certain degree of safety. The authors present an interesting study that is well motivated and designed. Their data is well presented and their conclusions largely follow from this data. Thank you for giving opportunity to review this study. However, the following points must be considered before publication. -Modify

the description of some errors in the article: e.g., Page 1 Line 19-20, ...study group (90.48%) ..... control group (71.43%), ... (P= 0.710). should be "study group (94.59%) and control group (75.68%), P=0.022"; Page 4 Line 11, should fill in the missing P value. Please check the full text. -Detailed description of the adverse events that occurred in the study. -English language correction through the manuscript. -Discuss merits and limitations of this study.

Thank you for your advice.

After receiving the comments, we read the article carefully and found some small loopholes in the article and made modifications. We described adverse events and the limitations of the study are described. The article was polished in native language.

According to the suggestion, we changed the relevant description.

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the World Journal of Clinical Cases.

Sincerely Yours,

Xiaoxia Wang