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Author’s response to reviews:

22nd January 2020

Dear Maxine Dillon,

We would like to thank you for the opportunity to resubmit the revised version of our manuscript “Lung virome in mechanical ventilated patients: a pilot study” (PULM-D-19-00374).

Please find below our answers to the issues now mentioned by the editor and the reviewers.

Sincerely yours,

Paulo Paixão
Editor and Reviewer Comments:

Reviewer 1 comments

1. Corresponding author

Please ensure that both the corresponding author email addresses, provided on the manuscript title page and in the submission system, are matching.

Revised.

2. Consent to participate

In the Ethical approval and consent to participate statement of the Declarations, please confirm whether informed consent was obtained from all participants and clearly state this in your manuscript. Please specify whether the consent was written or verbal. If verbal, please state the reason and whether the ethics committee approved this procedure.

Included (methods section, line 125, page 4).

3. Funding

In the Funding statement of the Declarations, please describe the role of the funding bodies in the study design, the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data, and in writing the manuscript.

Included (funding section, line 308, page 10).

Reviewer reports:

- Kristine Wylie (Reviewer 1): The authors have done a good job of addressing the reviewers' comments. There are a few things additional typos and issues that have come up in revision that should be addressed, and there are a couple of typos I hadn't noticed before.

1. Title -- should be "mechanically" ventilated instead of "mechanical"

Corrected

2. The authors cite "Dickson RP", and this should be "Dickson and Huffnagle"

Corrected (background section, line 89, page 3).
3. The specific double catheter should be noted along with the company from which it was obtained.

Included (Abstract section, line 46, page 2; methods section, line 136, page 5; discussion section, line 253, page 9).

4. "Analised" was not fixed -- should be "analyzed"

Corrected (discussion section, line 211, page 7)

5. The authors indicate that the kit they used had demonstrated that it had good performance because another study that had used it had more viral reads than other studies. More viral reads does not indicate this is a good kit -- the patients could be sicker, the samples could be collected differently, or many other possibilities. That statement should be removed.

Removed (discussion section)

6. "Ct's" should be "Ct values" or something similar.

Revised (discussion section, line 233 and 234, page 8).