

5/9/21

To the Editorial Staff:

Thank you for the opportunity to revise our submitted manuscript – “Bartonellosis in Transplant Recipients: A Retrospective Single Center Experience.” Kindly find below our point-by-point responses to editors’ and reviewers’ comments. In our revised manuscript, major changes are indicated with **highlighted** font.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Lauren Pischel, MD

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This paper describes a retrospective study of Bartonella henselae cases in transplant patients who received their care at the author’s institution between 2011 and 2018. Three cases were selected and described in detail regarding their medical history, diagnosis, treatment and follow up. The work is interesting and the paper is well written, despite several mistyping errors.

All typographical errors have been addressed.

The major problem with this paper consists in the lack of originality. There are several previous similar reports of B. henselae in solid organ transplant patients with similar results as indicated on the paper’s reference list. I could not see any novelty on the findings. There is no new hypothesis, or issues to be solved in the future, or any impact even in clinical practice. However, as it is a poorly diagnosed disease, and uncommon, it may be of interest to increase the description of cases, so I recommend the publication after minor review.

Thank you for your comments. We agree that this is a poorly diagnosed disease, and it can be beneficial to describe how it presents in the transplant population.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The authors report their single centre experience on the diagnosis and management of bartonellosis, a rare infectious disease in immunocompromised transplanted patients. I recommend some revisions: 1) Please summarise the findings in a table, as for the readers it would be easier to focus on the message

Thank you for your comments. We have included a summary table in our results section.

2)What could be the proposed algorithm in the suspect of bartonellosis? Also, would the authors suggest a particular tailored approach afterwards either in immunosuppression tailoring or in the screening?

We have included an additional figure (Figure 5) which represents a reasonable approach to *B. henselae* screening in the transplant population. As for tailoring therapy, we have added the following sentence to our discussion:

In absence of ample evidence to guide tapering of immunosuppressive regimens, we recommend multidisciplinary discussions between provider teams when approaching the possibility of reducing immunosuppression in transplant recipients undergoing treatment for bartonellosis.

3) Some sentences are not clear, for example please check in the discussion: "In our series, the diagnosis of bartonellosis proved difficult". (Did the author mean proved TO BE difficult?)

We have addressed this error, and all typographical mistakes were corrected.

Reviewer #3:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Nice design study, congrats, just only I advice you to cite about Case 2 and Case3 pathologic granuloma of caseification status in the text Best

The histopathology of Case 2 featured necrotizing granulomas, and only Case 3 was found to have caseating granulomas. We have included this in the Results section.

Editorial Office

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a Retrospective Study of the bartonellosis in transplant recipients. The topic is within the scope of the WJT. (1) Classification: Grade B, C and D;

Thank you for your comments.

(2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: Nice design study, congrats. Authors should add more about the description of cases, The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered;

We have done our best to address the reviewers' comments and now include a summary table of cases in our study.

(3) Format: There are 4 figures; (4) References: A total of 33 references are cited, including 5 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There is no self-cited reference. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A, B and B. The authors are native English speakers. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate, the Institutional Review Board Approval Form. Written informed consent was waived. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJT. 5 Issues raised: (1) The "Author Contributions" section is missing. Please provide the author contributions;

We have added an authors' contributions section.

(2) 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;

A PowerPoint with figure files has been included in our resubmission materials.

(3) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout; and

We have reformatted our references list accordingly.

(4) The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text.

We have added an "Article Highlights" section.

6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

We are pleased to be informed of our opportunity to revise and resubmit our manuscript. We appreciate the work of the editorial staff and reviewers.

Editor-in-chief

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Transplantation, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

Thank you for your comments.