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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Prof. Fabiano Di Marco,

I am pleased to resubmit the revised version of PULM-D-17-00388R1, "The Mortality Risk Factor of Community Acquired Pneumonia Patients with Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease: A Retrospective Cohort Study". I appreciate the constructive criticisms of the Reviewers, and we have revised the main text in accordance with Reviewers’ comments to the original version of the paper.

Please find the attached point-by-point response to reviewer’s concerns. We sincerely hope you find our revised manuscript is acceptable for publication.

Sincerely,

Jin-Fu Xu, Ph.D., M.D.
Salvatore Battaglia (Reviewer 1):

Although the Authors replied to my point in a satisfactory way, they only transferred a very limited part of these replies into the main test. I believe that these points could be of interest to readers. For this reason, I encourage the Authors to give more details in the main test and not only in the point-by-point reply.

Answer: We appreciate your constructive advice. We have revised and given more details in the main text according to our last point-point response. The changes in the main text are listed as below. Please find them in the revised manuscript.

Page 9, Date collection.

Table 1; Page 11, Patients characteristics;

Supplementary Materials Table 1; Page 11, Patients characteristics;

Figure 1; Page 11, Patients characteristics.

Supplementary Materials Table 2 and 3; Page 14, Mortality risk factors.

Table 3 and 4; Page 13, Mortality risk factors.

Supplementary Materials Figure 1.
Silvia Terraneo, MD (Reviewer 2): Thank you for editing your manuscript that is now clearer. However I still do have some comments:

ABSTRACT

The abstract is now clearer and easier to follow. I suggest adding where the study was conducted (i.e. [...] at two hospitals "IN CHINA") and the months of the study (Jan-Jun) in addition to the years. Thanks for adding the percentage referred to COPD patients, the first decimal will be enough (as you reported at the beginning of the discussion). I suggest removing percentages from the IQR of the scores.

Answer: We appreciate reviewer's comments. We have revised ABSTRACT according to your suggestions. (Page 2)

MAIN TEXT

Introduction:

Lines 4-8: your sentences refer to two different studies (as indicated by the references) but it's not clear. This is to be better explained.

You better clarified the aim of the study. Nevertheless, in my opinion, at the end of the introduction, the sentence "the aim [...] to find the mortality risk factors to assess the COPD patients hospitalized with CAP" is not clear. The mortality risk factors are not something "to assess" a patient, please clarify.

Answer: Thanks for your suggestions. We have revised the INTRODUCTION part according to your advices. (Page 4, 2nd paragraph; Page 5, 2nd paragraph)
Statistical analysis: page 8 line 8, you should remove "such as pre-albumin level"

Answer: Thanks for your suggestions. We have remove it in Page 9.

Results: page 11, lines 4-10, please insert the reference to Table 3.

The information in results section "Patients characteristics" is somehow redundant since it is reported in Table 1, please underline only the most significant in the text.

You should provide the data of PSI and CURB in Table 1.

Answer: We appreciate reviewer's comments and suggestions. We have inserted the reference to Table 1-4. PATIENTS CHARACTERISTICS part has been revised according to your advices. (Page 11-12) The data of PSI, CURB-65 and APACHE- II scores (comparison of severity scores between COPD-CAP and nCOPD-CAP patients) were showed in Table 2.

The sentence structure is not always correct the whole manuscript needs an English editing.

Answer: Thanks for your suggestion. We have asked English native speaker to revise our manuscript.