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Dear editors,

Thank you for the allowing us an extra amount of time to address the referees’ comments. Here is a brief description of the amendments made according to their remarks.

**Referee 1**

Thank you for your comments.

**Referee 2**

Thank you for your comments. We have added some remarks regarding similarities and differences between our case and relevant cases already published.

**Referee 3**

Thank you for your comments. We have provided some points of similarity or dissimilarity between our case and relevant cases reported in the literature.

We have added a table summarizing the major laboratory exams of the patient throughout his stay in the ICU.

**Referee 4**

Thank you for your comments. Please, if you still feel that the case report is not ethical, comment on how it can meet ethical standards. The patient was managed according to the ABCDE (airway-breath-circulation-disability-environment) algorithm proposed by the American College of Surgeons Committee on Trauma as described in the ATLS principles. We provide a reference to this in the text. The patients did not undergo bronchoscopy and thus was not BALed. Explanations for not proceeding to bronchoscopy have been added to the discussion section.

Finally, we have addressed the numbering of the figures, so as to meet the respective references within the text. We have modified some pictures, in order to conceal some of the patient’s characteristics and preserve his anonymity. However, in this particular case the value of the pictures lies in some features present on the face and eyes of the patient, which, thus should be apparent to the reader. It should be noted, though, that the patient has been informed of the possibility of a publication, is aware and has approved the content of the manuscript from his point of view and consented to the publication of the photographs. We consider those photographs as educational and we do not deem it necessary to further mask the patient’s facial features.

Yours,

Eleni Sertaridou