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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Unexpected or unusual presentations of a disease

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: No

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: Yes

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

General comments
The manuscript improved significantly. Minor additional reviews are indicated.

1) Case presentation, First paragraph.
It seems there was a misunderstanding with respect to the comment previously sent to the authors: “It would be interesting to have information on two issues: (i) if previous usage of respiratory therapy solutions might have exposed the patient to fluids potentially contaminated with R. picketti and (ii) whether previous exposures to antimicrobial agents might have helped select for such a naturally resistant pathogen.”
The revised manuscript now reads in the case presentation: “The patient initially
presented with these symptoms without explicit risk factors for a nosocomial pulmonary infection since the patient didn’t use any respiratory therapy solutions nor was exposed to antimicrobial agents in the past five years”.

However, information on these two aspects relate to risk factors for acquisition of R. pickettii and not for acquisition of a nosocomial pulmonary infection.

The new sentence in the case presentation should say only “The patient did not refer exposure to respiratory therapy solutions and did not take any antimicrobial agents in the past five years”. The comment that these two events could have favored acquisition of R. pickettii belongs to the discussion, where they already were included.

2) Discussion, End of first paragraph.

The sentence “Furthermore, the patient had a negative history for use of antimicrobial agents in recent years, suggesting the possibility that this is a naturally resistant pathogen” should be deleted. It is already well known that R. pickettii has important natural resistance to several antibiotics.

3) Discussion, Second paragraph.

The sentence with information on the susceptibility of the isolate should be replaced to the section of case presentation (“In this case, the R. pickettii isolate was susceptible to cefoperazone sodium-sulbactam sodium, ceftazidime, and limipenem by the means of disk diffusion method. The pathogen was resistant to amikacin, cefoperazone, ciprofloxacin, mezlocillin, aztreonam, and gentamicin”)

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published
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