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Reviewer's report:

The authors have extensively revised the manuscript and addressed a plethora of comments from both reviewers + the editorial board.

The flow is much, and the quality of the MS has overall improved.

The only major comment is re: the first line of the discussion (line 197), which says that "our study "Our study demonstrated similar clinical remission between CAZ-AVI and standard treatment with antibiotics." This contradicts line 186, which says: "Eight patients (80%) in the CAZ-AVI group achieved clinical remission compared to 15 patients Eight patients (80%) in the CAZ-AVI group achieved clinical remission compared to 15 patients."

This is a clinically meaningful difference. We tend to focus a lot on the importance of p values < 0.05 in medical literature, but this isn't a universal truth (there is an abundance of emerging statistical literature about this). I would rephrase this as follows:

"Even though our small sample size likely precluded our ability to find statistically significant differences, our study demonstrated a clinically significant benefit of CAZ-AVI for the treatment of CRE infections, including those caused by OXA-48 producing organisms, compared to standard therapy."

Other comments:
Abstract: "A" carbapenemase gene, not "the" (line 70)

Line 146: technically, CRE is defined has ertrapenem MIC of >=2 or imi/mero/dori >=4; please make the change

Lines 216-218: I would delete. Not sure what this adds:
"The reported clinical outcomes are similar to our results; however, our 217 cohort population had complexity index of 5.5 compared to 3 in this study, and we think this is 218 a notable feature."
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