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Response to reviewers’ comments Manuscript MCR-D-17-00537

Aeromonas caviae mimicking V. cholerae infectious enteropathy in a cholera-endemic region - a case report with possible public health consequences

Comments

Responses

Reviewer #1:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic? Yes

   Thanks for comments
2. Do you have any ethical concerns? Comments: Please consider if local Institutional Review Board approval or ethical approval was obtained (if appropriate) and if the patient (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 18) gave written, informed consent to publish this case and any accompanying images. A statement to this effect should appear in the manuscript. no Thanks for comments

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature? Yes

Thanks for comments

4. a. Does the article report the following information? Where information is missing, please specify. The relevant patient information, including:
   - De-identified demographic information (age, gender, ethnicity)
   - Main symptoms of the patient
   - Medical, family and psychosocial history
   - Relevant past interventions and their outcomes NO CONCERNS IDENTIFIED

Thanks for comments

4 b. The relevant physical examination findings-yes

Thanks for comments

c. Important dates and times in this case (if appropriate, organized as a timeline via a figure or table); if specific dates could lead to patient identification, consider including time relevant to initial presentation, i.e. initial presentation at T = 0, follow up at T = 1 month.

APPROPRIATE

Thanks for comments

d. Diagnostic assessments, including:
   - Diagnostic methods
   - Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural)
   - Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable
NO CONCERNS IDENTIFIED

    Thanks for comments

e. Types and mechanism of intervention

APPROPRIATE

    Thanks for comments

f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits

Comments: APPROPRIATE

    Thanks for comments

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?

Comments: yes

    justified treatment appropriately

    Thanks for comments

6. Is the anonymity of the patient protected? Please consider any identifying information in images such as facial features or nametags, whether the patient is named etc. If not, please detail below.

    Yes/No

    YES

    Thanks for comments

7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?

Comments: yes

    Thanks for comments

8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?
Comments:

yes, this is a good contribution to medical literature  Thanks for comments

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?

Reviewer #2:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic?

Yes

   Thanks for comments

2. Do you have any ethical concerns? Comments: Please consider if local Institutional Review Board approval or ethical approval was obtained (if appropriate) and if the patient (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 18) gave written, informed consent to publish this case and any accompanying images. A statement to this effect should appear in the manuscript.

   no

   Thanks for comments

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?

Please make the introduction short and informative.

   Thanks for the comments. The introduction has been revised and word reduced from 1552 to 1162 while keeping it informative.

4. a. Does the article report the following information? Where information is missing, please specify. . The relevant patient information, including:

   - De-identified demographic information (age, gender, ethnicity)
   - Main symptoms of the patient
   - Medical, family and psychosocial history
   - Relevant past interventions and their outcomes
4 b. The relevant physical examination findings—yes

Thanks for comments

c. Important dates and times in this case (if appropriate, organized as a timeline via a figure or table); if specific dates could lead to patient identification, consider including time relevant to initial presentation, i.e. initial presentation at T = 0, follow up at T = 1 month.

Thanks for comments

d. Diagnostic assessments, including:
   - Diagnostic methods
   - Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural)
   - Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable

Thanks for comments

e. Types and mechanism of intervention

Thanks for comments

f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits

Comments: 4—Yes

Thanks for comments

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?

Comments: yes

Thanks for comments

6. Is the anonymity of the patient protected? Please consider any identifying information in images such as facial features or nametags, whether the patient is named etc. If not, please detail below.
Yes/No

comment: YES

Thanks for comments

7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?

Comments: yes

Thanks for comments

8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?

Comments: yes

Thanks for comments

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?