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Dear Sheryl Ramos
Journal Editorial Office
BioMed Central

We are most grateful to you and the reviewers for the helpful comments on the revised version of our manuscript. We have taken all these comments into account and submit re-revised version of our paper.

We have addressed all the comments by Referee 1 and Referee 2, as indicated on the attached pages, and we hope that explanations and revisions of our work are satisfactory.

We hope that the revised version of our paper is now suitable for publication in *BMC Infectious Diseases* and we look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely,
Satoshi Marumo, M.D.
Respiratory Disease Center, Tazuke Kofukai Medical Research Institute, Kitano Hospital
2-4-20 Ohgimachi, Kita-ku, Osaka 530-8480, Japan
Phone: +81-6-6312-8831
Fax: +81-6-6361-8867
E-mail: marumo@kuhp.kyoto-u.ac.jp
Responses to referee 1

Comment 1:

Minor Essential Revisions

Page 5: "CURB-65 was consist of" should be changed to "CURB-65 consisted of". Similar for A-DROP.

Answer 1:

We are very sorry for a simple mistake we made.

Change 1:

We corrected the sentence as the referee’s comment (line 91 and 94).

Comment 2:

Discretionary Revisions

I believe my last review recommendation to perform a logistic regression to adjust for severity comparing Ampicillin-Sulbactam to Azithromycin, using CURB-65 and A-DROP as severity adjustors, was misunderstood. The intent is not to compare the two severity markers; the intent is to calculate an odds ratio for mortality after adjustment for severity.

Answer 2:

We are very sorry to misunderstand the referee’s comment. Now we performed logistic regressions to adjust for the severity. The odds ratios (OR) for the success rate of 1st-line antibiotics comparing ABPC/SBT group to AZM group were 0.901 (95% CI: 0.360 – 2.258) and 0.887 (95% CI: 0.352 – 2.234) after adjustment by CURB-65 and ADROP, respectively. The OR for mortality comparing ABPC/SBT group to AZM group were 1.297 (95% CI: 0.310 – 5.433) and 1.258 (95% CI: 0.293 – 5.408) after adjustment by CURB-65 and ADROP, respectively. These results suggest that there was not significant difference in the success rate of 1st-line antibiotics nor the mortality between the two groups in the present study.

Change 2:

We modified the manuscript on line 152-153 and 196-201.
Responses to referee 2

Comment 1:
Minor point
Line 111-112
The sentence "Anaerobic ..." should be excluded from the methods. The discussion as revised is needed.

Answer 1:
We totally agree with the referee’s suggestion. We excluded the sentence “Anaerobic cultures of sputum samples were not performed” from the methods. According to the referee’s comment in the major points No.2 of the referee’s first report, we also discussed that potent activities of AZM against atypical pathogens including Chlamydophila might have influenced the clinical outcomes in the present study.

Change 1:
We excluded the sentence “Anaerobic cultures of sputum samples were not performed” from the methods and modified the discussion on line 286-288.