## Reply for paper (Manuscript NO.: 76010, Case Report)

## Metagenomic Next-Generation Sequencing for Pleural Effusions

**Induced by Viral Pleurisy: A Case Report** 

Xue-Ping Liu<sup>1\*</sup>, Chen-Xue Mao<sup>2\*</sup>, Guan-Song Wang<sup>1</sup>, Ming-Zhou Zhang<sup>1#</sup>

Thank you for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript. Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our research. We studied comments carefully and made correction which we hope meet with approval. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer's comments are as following.

## Point-by-point response to reviewer 1:

- 1. Q1: Conclusion part is long. You should use no more than 20 words.
  - Answer: Thanks for this suggestion. We have modified our conclusion of abstract.
- 2. Q2: The manuscript is well and good organized. Similarity rate is 25%. You should decrease similarity. You should paraphrase the discussion part.

Answer: Thanks for this suggestion. We have modified the discussion part and decreased the similarity