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Author’s response to reviews:

Technical Comments:

Editor Comments:
The revised manuscript has substantially improved, following all previous recommendations.

I have some additional suggestions:

First of all, the quality of English has improved, but a second look would further benefit the manuscript.

ANSWER: We sent for a second English review.
In the version of the manuscript with track changes:

ANSWER: We included a reference.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria: please remove the table and include them only in text.
ANSWER: We excluded the table.

Line 222: correct intensive therapy unit to ICU.
ANSWER: We changed it.

Line 269: correct number of the no-oral switch patients to 238.
ANSWER: We changed it.

Lines 285-293: please explain further, by providing additional information on the various outcomes. Also rephrase accordingly, eg. correct “confusion” to confounding and please explain how they were removed and how subsequently the 2 groups were different.
ANSWER: We explained the exclusion of confounding varibles with the binary regression and corrected the terms.

Discussion: consider shortening at certain points and focus only on the meaningful comparisons of the study.
ANSWER: We excluded the following sentences suggested by the referee.

Line 331: is this a tendency, or an observation?
ANSWER: Tendency.
Line 382: what do the authors mean by “the range of microbiological profiles”? Consider expressing otherwise.

ANSWER: Specific microbiological profile. We change the term range.

Line 391-392: “Therefore, only the possible impact on mortality is investigated. The literature about the possible impact of nasogastric administration of antimicrobials is poor” This is unnecessary.

ANSWER: OK.

Lines 394-397: “Information… intervention.”. This is unnecessary.

ANSWER: OK.

Conclusion:

Lines 405-406: I suggest omitting “by a multidisciplinary team”.

ANSWER: OK.

Line 409: I suggest omitting “antimicrobial control”.

ANSWER: OK.

Table 3: Suggested legend: “Isolated bacteria by intervention group”

ANSWER: OK.

Table 4: Suggested legend: “Patient costs by intervention group”. Please also clarify the units used.

ANSWER: OK.