

Answering Reviewers:

1. Title. The title does reflect properly the content of the manuscript, but I suggest adding “literature review” to properly reflect the type of article.

Appreciate for your affirmation. We have followed your suggestions to modify the title

2. Abstract. The abstract reflects very well all aspects of the manuscript; however, I fail to understand why mentioning BP infection being a biological weapon brings any scientific value to this manuscript. Authors should restrain to a brief morphological description of the bacteria, such as type of gram, polar or bipolar, motility, overall shape and, of course, its full scientific classification (phylum, class, order, family, genus, etc).

At first, we described *Burkholderia pseudomallei* as a biological weapon to reveal why *Burkholderia pseudomallei* has a high incidence rate in Southeast Asia and coastal areas in Southwest China. Because of its widespread use in the Vietnam War, *Burkholderia pseudomallei* widely exists in the soil and waters of the above areas. After in-depth consideration together with your mentioned, this viewpoint does not provide any scientific value for this case report and even cause controversy. Therefore, we have adopted the reviewer's opinion to conduct morphological analysis of *Burkholderia pseudomallei*.

3. Key Words. Well chosen.

Thank you for your affirmation.

4. Introduction. This section is well constructed and has enough citations.

Thank you for your affirmation.

5. Case presentation sections: - all subsections are properly constructed; - the authors provide a CARE Checklist (2016) statement.

Thank you for your affirmation

6. Discussion. Please move the actual figure (figure 1) at the first appearance in text – Section 2 – Case Presentation – Imaging examinations, where it belongs.

We have moved the image to its intended location as your command.

7. Conclusions. Please move Figure 2, containing the bone marrow histological investigation to Section 2 – Case Presentation – Bone marrow smear, where it belongs.

We have moved the image to its intended location as your command.

8. Illustrations and tables. Tables are properly redacted. The figures are good for publishing.

Thank you for your affirmation.

9. Biostatistics. Not applicable.

Biostatistics are not applicable for this case report.

10. Units. All units are standard.

Thank you for your affirmation.

11. References. The list of 13 references is adequate, and so is the timespan.

Thank you for your affirmation.

12. Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. It is fit for publication.

Thank you for your affirmation.

13. Backmatter section. It is properly redacted, even though it is place at the front of the article.

Thank you for your affirmation

14. Ethics statements. It is missing; even though the authors provide a written consent for publication on behalf of the patient, a proper ethics committee approval was not provided.

Our manuscript has been approved by the Ethics Committee of Hainan General Hospital and the ethics report will be uploaded together with the revised manuscript.