

Re: Manuscript NO.: 68795, Case Report

Dear editors and dear reviewers,

Thank you for your letter and the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "**Fatal community-acquired bloodstream infection caused by *klebsiella variicola*: a case report**". Those comments are valuable and very helpful. We have read through comments carefully and have made corrections. Based on the instructions provided in your letter, we uploaded the file of the revised manuscript. Revisions in the text are shown using red highlight for additions, and strikethrough font for deletions. The responses to the reviewer's comments and editors' suggestions are marked in red and presented following. We would love to thank you for allowing us to resubmit a revised copy of the manuscript and we highly appreciate your time and consideration.

Sincerely.

Jianquan

Reviewer #1:

Firstly, many thanks for your summary, we really appreciate your efforts in reviewing our manuscript. We have responded the question you

concerned and detailed below.

Q: I concern about detail of report in The PMseq-DNA Pro high throughput gene detection from blood sample " the authors show 2 type of kiebsiella found in blood sample but in conclusion of case report, the authors conclude in only K.variicola infection" please give moer deatail about that.

Response: We are grateful for the suggestion. As our results shown, klebsiella pneumoniae was detected in both conventional bacterial cultures and genetic tests, but the antibiotics sensitive to klebsiella pneumoniae were not effective. Klebsiella variicola was found in genetic testing (which cannot be detected by conventional methods), but treatment for subspecies was not performed due to delayed results, so although there are two bacterial infections, we believe that the fatal infection is caused by subspecies. (In our revised version, we marked our explanation in second paragraph, fifth sentence in red)

Science editor:

Q1. The value of the manuscript is undermined by the quality of its writing in the English language.

Response. We apologize for the language problems in the original manuscript. The language presentation was improved with assistance from

a native English speaker with appropriate research background.

Q2. There are many necessary corrections in this aspect of the manuscript such as: page 2 line 5, it should read "however, it is often..." instead of "however, which is often"; page 2 line 13 and 14, this sentence needs to be rewritten to increase its clarity; on page 2 line 18 it should read "clinical evidence"; page 2 line 21 it should read as "case reported in which the patient died"; page 3 line 9 the word infection is redundant in this sentence; page 9 line 22 it should read "could not improve the patients condition"; page 11 line 16 "klebsiella variicola is associated"; page 11 line 21 "did not respond well to treatment".

Response. According to editor's suggestion, we proofread the whole article and polish the language under the help from a native English-speaking expert, and all above language problems have been revised.

Q3. In the discussion section, the authors could comment on the typical patterns of antibiotic resistance usually present in *Klebsiella variicola*.

Response: According to suggestion, we have added the comments on antibiotic resistance in *Klebsiella variicola*: "Similar to *K. pneumoniae*, drug-resistant plasmids in the bacterial structure of *K. variicola* contribute to its virulence and resistance, but the *K. variicola* has the higher-risk antibiotic resistance genes sequences, thus giving it higher virulence and resistance."

Q4. Images in the presentation of figures 2 and 5 could be improved. Please

include DOI and PMID numbers for all references.

Response.: We are grateful for the suggestion. We improved the figure 2 and figure 5, and add the DOI or PMID numbers for all references.

Company editor-in-chief:

Q1. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor. Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s).

Response : Many thanks for editor-in-chief's suggestion, by the online systems, we have provided the original figure documents, arrange the figures using PowerPoint and upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy.