

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers, comments concerning our manuscript entitled "Paper Title" (ID: 75285). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to this case report. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer's comments are as flowing:

Reviewer #1: Dear Authors, Thank you for submitting your manuscript entitled, "Successful treatment of disseminated nocardiosis diagnosed by metagenomic next-generation sequencing" in WJCC. The manuscript is well written and compactly summarized, and the topic is interesting. However, one major criticisms should be addressed as below. Major 1) Please add a new table on the same or similar cases that have been reported to date as your case. Please describe the search method, keywords, etc. Also, please add your own opinions, fluent discussions, so called "systematic literature review" on the new Table to the Discussion section. Further, add more references. I think that *Nocardia* of the lung is not so rare, so it will be very important to add the literature review on the cases and case series that have been reported to date.

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript. We had made "A PubMed/MEDLINE ((*nocardiosis*[Title]) AND lung[Abstract]) search of literature tracked a total of seventeen within a decade except for the references already cited in the article [20-36]" in Table 3. The details were described in the last paragraph of the Discussion section.

Reviewer #2: The authors present a rare case of disseminated nocardiosis, with accent to rapid mNGS diagnosis. The roadmap of presenting the case is clearly noted in Abstract / Core tip section. Otherwise, the Introduction should me much shorter and focusesd on the topic. The Discussion should compare the presented case with more other from the literature. Final diagnosis and Treatment are not main paragraphs.

Table 1 and 2 had been added to better describe the case. The introduction had been shorter and more focused. The discussion section had been shortened and the corresponding literature has been added to compare with this case.

We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers' warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.

Yours Sincerely,

Ying Meng
Department of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine
Nanfang Hospital, Southern Medical University
Guangzhou 510515, China
E-mail: nfyymengy@163.com

Signature of authors:

Ting Li
Yi-Xin Chen
Jia-Jia Lin
Wei-Xian Lin
Wei-Zhen Zhang
Hang-Ming Dong
Shao-Xi Cai