

Dennis A Bloomfield, Bao-Gan Peng, Sandro Vento

Editors-in-Chief

World Journal of Clinical Cases

Dear Editors:

Thank you very much for having our manuscript entitled “Daptomycin and linezolid for severe MRSA Psoas abscess and bacteraemia: a case report and review of the literature.” reviewed in a timely and professional manner and for providing us with the opportunity to revise the manuscript.

We also deeply appreciate the reviewer for the critical review of the manuscript and for the thoughtful and constructive comments. The manuscript has been carefully rechecked and appropriate changes have been made in accordance with the reviewer’s suggestions. In particular, the changes made in the revised manuscript are highlighted by colored (red) text; our point-by-point responses to the reviewer’s comments are detailed in the attached document. In addition, the revised manuscript has been checked by a native English speaker to ensure the language quality of our manuscript.

We believe that the integration of the reviewer’s comments has substantially improved the manuscript. We hope that you and the reviewer will agree that we have addressed all the concerns raised in the previous review and that the revised manuscript is now suitable for publication in *World Journal of Clinical Cases*.

Thank you for your re-consideration of our manuscript; we are looking forward to your favorable decision.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. Iie Chen

Department of Pharmacy, The First Affiliated Hospital, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510080,
GuangDong Province, China

E-mail: chenjiezs@163.com

Response to the Reviewer

1. Please see the edits as track changes in the manuscript. I would also discuss the omadacycline, which has been approved for the Skin and skin structure infection for MRSA and has good data. That also should be the part of the discussion.

Response: We greatly appreciate this useful suggestion. As recommended, We have discussed *omadacycline, which has been approved for the Skin and skin structure infection for MRSA.*

2. Firstly, thank you for opportunity to review very interested article. 1. The title reflect the main subject about treatment with daptomycin and linezolid for severe MRSA infection, title was clear and easy to understand. 2. The abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript. 3. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript. 4. The manuscript adequately describe the background, present status, and significance of the study. The authors explain MRSA infection with vancomycin (first line drug). In this study show benefit of combined daptomycin and linezolid. 5. The manuscript describe methods in adequate detail, study subjects were clear, with demonstrate IRB number or text to human ethics consideration. 6. The research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study. 7. The manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly, and logically. 8. Tables and figures sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. 9. The manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics. 10. The manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections. Due to in this case use multiple antibiotic durgs, I suggested the authors add figure or timeline in antibiotic used, it's make this study more interested.

Response: We are very appreciative of the reviewer's positive comments. We have also added timeline in antibiotic used in figure3.