

Reply to the Reviewers/Editor.

Dear Respected Editor/Reviewer

Good day

Thank you very much for the comprehensive review and the precious time you spent reviewing this study. We made the advised changes and answered the queries. All the changes were marked red for easy tracking by the reviewer. The manuscript looks much better with these changes. We tried to improve the language as we could. Thank you again for your precious assistance. Here we are replying point by point:

The reviewer's Comments:

Reviewer 1:

Greetings I read the manuscript with interest. Although the topic is well known, it still have clinical value. Overall the study is well conducted, written, and described. The limitations of the study are also well mentioned. In my opinion the study do not have a major flaws or limitation, no ethical concerns and has scientific credibility.

Our reply: Thank you very much for your excellent feedback.

However, a few minor aspects need attention.

1. You mention adult (>14 years). the age >14 years are not regarded as adults. Please rewrite.

Our reply: Thank you very much for your observation; the correction was done and coloured in red.

2. You mentioned average ICU days before getting VAP and then presented the data as mean +/- SD. please correct.

Our reply: Thank you very much for your observation; the correction was done and coloured in red.

3. The study type- prospective case-control is better termed as a cross-sectional study.

Our reply: Thank you very much for your observation; the correction was done and coloured in red.

4. What types of culture were done- aerobic / anaerobic or both? 5. was fungal staining or cultures were also done? Best of luck

Our reply: Both aerobic, anaerobic, and fungal cultures were included. We made it more clear in the method section. Changes were highlighted in red.

Reviewer 2:

Dear authors! I am very happy to get the chance to review your manuscript. Here is my evaluation:

The title reflects the main subject thesis of the manuscript.

Our reply: Thank you very much for your excellent feedback.

The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript, the keywords reflect the focus of your manuscript, and it also adequately describes the background, present status, and significance of your study.

Our reply: Thank you very much for your excellent feedback.

The manuscript describes methods in an appropriate way. Research objectives are achieved by the experiments used in this study. The contribution of your study is very important for patient care and cure to prevent further complications during mechanical ventilation. The manuscript interprets the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly, and logically.

Our reply: Thank you very much for your excellent feedback.

Findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature are stated in a clear and definite manner. Discussion is accurate and discusses the paper's scientific significance and relevance to clinical practice sufficiently.

Our reply: Thank you very much for your excellent feedback.

The tables are sufficient, of good quality, and appropriately illustrative of the paper's contents. The manuscript meets the requirements of statistical analysis.

Our reply: Thank you very much for your excellent feedback.

The manuscript appropriately cites the latest, important, and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections. It is well, concisely, and coherently organized and presented.

Our reply: Thank you very much for your excellent feedback.

Style, language, and grammar are accurate and appropriate? The authors prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting. The manuscript meets the requirements of ethics. Best regards! Your reviewer

Our reply: Thank you very much for your excellent feedback.

Many thanks

Professor Mohammed Elbeltagi