

Dear Na Ma, Company Editor-in-Chief, Editorial Office
Baishideng Publishing Group Inc

Thank you for your mail dated September 24, 2020,

We revised our invited manuscript NO: 57924 titled “Spontaneous bacterial peritonitis due to carbapenemase-producing Enterobacteriaceae: Etiology and antibiotic treatment”, submitted to *World Journal of Hepatology*. According to the reviewer and Editorial Office’s comments and suggestions we provided a point to point response. We also highlighted the change in red according to the comments.

Thank you very much for your efforts in expediting the processing of our manuscript.

Sincerely,

Marco Fiore, MD

October 8, 2020

ANSWERS TO REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This review is dealing with the etiology and treatment of spontaneous bacterial peritonitis due to carbapenemase-producing Enterobacteriaceae, as emerging bacterial agents in this severe entity. The abstract summarizes in a correct manner the data presented in the paper. I would not use “review” as a keyword. Also, “ascites” could be not used. In the Introduction the authors presented very concise and clear the importance of this review as infections caused by CRE are severe, with high mortality and the current guidelines for antibiotics are insufficient. The review is structured in 3 parts, presenting the burden of carbapenemase-producing Enterobacteriaceae in SBP, the molecular characteristics and the antimicrobial management of SBP. Data of different studies with CRE SBP reviewed are very interesting, the authors included in one table results of some studies (I would suggest improving the title of Table 1...). Also, I would suggest including a legend in Figure 1 for all abbreviations presented there. In the last part, the authors reviewed the last data on different medications and combinations that could be used for SBP due to carbapenemase-producing Enterobacteriaceae. I suggest to include another table to have a clear and quick view of all these medications with advantages, disadvantages. In this way the reader could have a image of all possibilities of treatment. The authors based their review on 80 important papers including also very recent papers, published 2019-2020. The manuscript is well and concisely organized with appropriate language and correct grammar. But, still there are some typo corrections that should be done.

As suggested by the reviewer:

- We have deleted the two improper keywords (review and ascites)
- We have improved the title of Table 1
- We have improved the legend of abbreviation of Table 1 and Figure 1
- We have included a new Table (Table 5) to describe medications advantages and disadvantages
- We have solved all the typo errors

4 LANGUAGE QUALITY

Please resolve all language issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report. Please be sure to have a native-English speaker edit the manuscript for grammar, sentence structure, word usage, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, format, and general readability, so that the manuscript's language will meet our direct publishing needs.

We have solved all the typo errors. The native speaker in our group has checked the full text of the manuscript.

5 EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

(1) Science editor: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a minireviews of the Spontaneous bacterial peritonitis due to carbapenemase-producing enterobacteriaceae. The topic is within the scope of the WJH. (1) Classification: Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The manuscript is well and concisely organized with appropriate language and correct grammar. The abstract summarizes in a correct manner the data presented in the paper. However, there are still some typo corrections that should be done. The questions raised by the reviewer should be answered; and (3) Format: There are 4 tables and 1 figure. A total of 80 references are cited, including 31 references published in the last 3 years. There are 12 self-citations. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the signed Copyright License Agreement, but the Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form is not qualified. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. The topic has not previously been published in the WJH. 5 Issues raised: The authors did not provide original pictures. 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. 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

(2) Editorial office director: I have checked the comments written by the science editor.

(3) Company editor-in-chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted with major revisions. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before final acceptance, authors need to correct the issues raised by the editor to meet the publishing requirements.

As required:

-We attach to the response e-mail the Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form

-We attach the original Picture using PowerPoint file