

Dear editor,

Thank you for carefully reviewing our manuscript "The Diagnosis of Encephalitis using Metagenomic Next-Generation Sequencing of Blood and Cerebrospinal Fluid: A Case Report". We have revised our manuscript and answered the reviewers' comments point-by-point.

If any further questions or recommendations, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Reviewer #1: Firstly, thank you for opportunity to review very interested article. I feel qualified to judge about the English language and style 1. The title reflect the subject about diagnosis of CMV encephalitis from blood and CSF, title was clear and easy to understand. 2. The abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript. However, I suggested the authors to revised this sentence "Cytomegalovirus (CMV) infection is very common in the population" because I not very common. 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 pathogenesis of CMV infection. In line 48 "CMV infection is very common in the population" please revised about that. 5. The manuscript describe methods in adequate detail, study subjects were clear, with demonstrate IRB number or text to human ethics consideration. The detail of case presentation was complete and easy to understand. 6. The research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study. 7. The manuscript interpret the findings adequately appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly, and logically. 8. Tables figures sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. However Figure 2 A B D were poor quality, please revised about that. 9. The manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections.

Resopnse: Thank you for your time and effort to review our manuscript, and your suggestions are really helpful for us. We have revised the sentence "Cytomegalovirus (CMV) infection is very common in the population" at the abstract section and background section (Line 48) in the manuscript. In addition, we have drawn a clearer picture for Figure 2 A, B, and D.

Reviewer #2: Need some details of the report. Critical view is missing. Needs to improve the results analysis and add more details. References are poor. Add 8-10 recent literatures.

Resopnse: Thank you for your careful review. We have added some details of the report in the discussion section, including the clinical results analysis (Line 176-188) and description of different diagnostic methods (Line 164-175). We have also added 9 references in the background and discussion sections of the manuscript.