

Dear Editor:

We thank you in advance for the opportunity to publish our manuscript in your prestigious journal.

Through this letter, we send the corrections to the observations of your reviewers based on the parts of the article. We also enclose the version with change control (with corrections) as well as the corrected version.

Likewise, information on the clinical follow-up of the case was added at the request of the reviewers.

We hope that the changes made are satisfactory to be able to fulfill what is necessary for the publication of the manuscript.

Thank you in advance, we remain attentive to your suggestions.

Sincerely:

Gustavo Adolfo Valencia Mesías (Corresponding autor)

Ana Lucía Castillo Soto

Iliana Cano Calero

In this document, we attach the corrections made:

General fixes

- The following spelling points were modified:
 - o Diabetes was corrected to diabetes
 - o Mellitus was corrected to mellitus
 - o Corrected gran-positive to Gram-positive
 - o Lactococcus was corrected to L.
 - o Corrected Garvieae to garvieae
 - o Fixed Fasciitis to Fasciitis
 - o Corrected genre to genus
 - o Corrected germs to bacteria
 - o Corrected Sulfamethoxazole to sulfamethoxazole

Corrections by Editor

Reviewer A:

Recommendation: Resubmit for Review

1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article

Regular

Remarks

Although the title is in agreement with the content of the manuscript, a direct relationship between the presented case and the COVID-19 could not be evidenced.

2. Summary: Presents the general idea of the topic, objectives, research methods, results and conclusions, written in an objective and concise manner; and are found according to the maximum number of words per section.

Regular

Remarks

The abstract presents the general idea of the manuscript with a objectively and concisely written. However, methodology applied to identification of microorganism was no mentioned.

3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner

Poor

Corrections: The following modified introduction is proposed

- Modification of the title of Fasciitis by *Lactococcus garvieae* on an immunosuppressed patient by Diabetes Mellitus and previous COVID-19 pneumonia, to the following title: Fasciitis by *Lactococcus garvieae* on an immunosuppressed patient by diabetes mellitus
- It is indicated that the *Lactococcus garvieae* isolate is rarely found in human samples.
- The bibliographic references were updated (reference number 2)
- Citations were withdrawn in some parts of the introduction (references 4 and 5)

4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and analysis.

Poor

Remarks

The methodology is poorly written. The authors did not describe how the samples were collected and what laboratory procedures were performed to identify the microorganism and determine its antimicrobial susceptibility profile. In addition, it is not clear which guideline was used to interpret antimicrobial susceptibility results. Finally, the authors did not explain why antimicrobials were modified.

- To improve the methodology, procedures and techniques used in data collection, data is modified in relation to the description of the case:

Corrected version:

Once the first culture result of the operating room arrived, and it was revealed the isolation of *L. garvieae*, the team made the medical interconsultation to the Infectology department for antimicrobial optimization (Table 1). Considering the antimicrobial susceptibility shown by automated VITEK-2 equipment and through medical literature review, an optimization strategy was performed consisting of parenteral vancomycin plus Trimethoprim/Sulfamethoxazole orally every 12 hours. Clindamycin treatment was suspended according of the medical review. Daily surgical cures were continued by the surgical department. In posterior secretion cultures, it was evidenced by the same etiological agent.

5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee, informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics?

Yes

6. Results: They are presented adequately and it is not redundant with tables or graphs shown.

Poor

Remarks

Although the clinical case has been satisfactory described, microbiology data were not presented. In addition to write the results better, Table should be carefully revised. Where is the Table legend? What is the meaning of asterisk, MIC, R, S...? What are MIC values? Finally, the authors should provide the reference of guideline used.

- Modifications are made to the descriptive tables as well as the descriptive text of the susceptibility determination.

Corrected version:

For species identification from cultures, Vitek 2 kit with GP identification card (Biomérieux) was performed in our medical institution, reporting isolation of *L. garvieae* in 3 samples from surgical interventions, with same susceptibility records.

Tabla actual

Sample	Abscess Secretion		
Date	C1 (11/11/20)	C2 (11/13/20)	C3 (11/13/20)
Agent	<i>Lactococcus Garvieae</i>		
Antibiotics	Results	Results	Results
Benzympenicillin	S	R	S
Levofloxacin	R	S	R
Cefotaxime	R	R	-
Trimethopin/Sulfamethoxazole	R	R	R
Erythromycin	S	S	S
Vancomycin	S	S	S
Clindamycin	S	S	S
Rifampicin	S	S	S
Linezolid	S	S	S

7. Discussion: They present a level of critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented. Purposes of the article, scope, support theory and proposed methodological design.

Regular

Remarks

Although there are some problems in the writing and in argumentation, the discussion addresses the subject satisfactorily. I suggest merging some of the paragraphs of the introduction with those in the discussion, as well as reviewing the points highlighted in the attached revised file.

8. Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study.

Regular

Remarks

Although microbiological identification is important to establish the appropriate therapy, the other conclusions are speculative.

9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format.

Good

Remarks

10. Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written? Does it contain any spelling or grammar mistakes?

Requires a thorough assessment of grammar and spelling

- Corrections: grammar corrections were made throughout the text, optimizing the writing.

11. Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it

The subject is interesting and has relevance to the field. However, the manuscript needs careful writing review, considering not only spelling and grammar, but scientific language (eg, biological nomenclature). Furthermore, relevant data on microbiological analyses were not provided in the manuscript.

Reviewer B:

Recommendation: Revisions Required

1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article

Regular

Remarks

2. Summary: Presents the general idea of the topic, objectives, research methods, results and conclusions, written in an objective and concise manner; and are found according to the maximum number of words per section.

Poor

Remarks

The objectives and methods are not clearly explained in the abstract.

- Modifications are made to better show the objectives of this manuscript

Corrected version:

Lactococcus garvieae, Gram-positive anaerobe facultative coccus, is a well-known pathogen in the aquaculture and cattle sector, being extremely rare for human beings. There are some case reports of infections caused by this microorganism, however, there are not fasciitis cases up to date. This is a case of a 24-year-old patient with uncontrolled diabetes mellitus and previous COVID-19 pneumonia without sequels, admitted to the emergency room for a compatible case of fasciitis. Three cultures for *L. garvieae* were obtained from surgical debridement and microbiological studies were performed using automated VITEK-2 equipment. No posterior complications were documented. The patient went through a skin graft with a favorable response without evidence of clinical relapse.

3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner

Poor

- The wording of the introduction is optimized, correcting the comments of the reviewers.

- The following spelling points were modified:

o Diabetes was corrected to diabetes

o Mellitus was corrected to mellitus

o Corrected gran-positive to Gram-positive

o Lactococcus was corrected to L.

o Corrected Garvieae to garvieae

o Fixed Fasciitis to Fasciitis

o Corrected genre to genus

o Corrected germs to bacteria

o Corrected Sulfamethoxazole to sulfamethoxazole

Remarks

In the introduction it is not clear the purpose of this study. The systematic of the introduction writing is not good, so the urgency and the newness of this research is not clear.

- The introduction is better written, correcting grammar and using better syntax.

Corrected version:

Lactococcus garvieae is a Gram-positive coccus, facultative anaerobic and catalase-negative, that is rarely isolated from human samples, considering the relation with previous animal exposure. It is responsible for certain infectious processes like bovine mastitis or fish infections, but it's extremely odd on human beings (1). Initially, it was found on septic processes in 1950 in Japan, related to the breeding of the rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*), as well as in consumption of non-pasteurized dairy products. However, over the past years, there have been appearing new unconventional case reports on the literature (2). Between those new cases, there has been described endocarditis, osteomyelitis, meningitis, hepatic abscess, and peritonitis (3).

In the present article, we are reporting the case of fasciitis by *L. garvieae* on an immunosuppressed patient (because of diabetes mellitus), with a successful response to antibiotics and surgical cleanings.

No previous report cases were documented in Peru related to infections caused by *L. garvieae* on humans, being this the first reported case in our country, as well as the first fasciitis case on the worldwide literature.

Considering this report the first case of fasciitis by this bacteria, clinical course of illness could not be predicted; however, the actual clinical manifestations reflect the natural process of bacterial fasciitis similar to infections caused by common germs (4). All the case reports on the literature determined the bacterial endocarditis (principally of the native valve) as the most frequent clinical presentation, followed by the sepsis cases and the joint prosthesis infections(3).

During its inpatient care time there, no additional complications were reported, showing a successful response to the antibiotic coverage based on parenteral vancomycin and trimethoprim/Sulfamethoxazole plus daily cures and surgical cleanings.

4. Methodology: Describes the procedure, methods and techniques used in data collection and analysis.

Poor

Remarks

Although this is a case report, there must still be a clear research method, how to collect patients, interview patients, etc. if secondary data, where did the data come from? not described in this study. Ethical clearance must be included in the manuscript (approval number).

- The following paragraph was written to describe what was requested:

Clinical follow-up by the infectious diseases' physicians and interviews with the patient were made to verify clinical improvement secondary to antimicrobial recommendations. In addition, recommendations for surgical cleaning were performed to the surgical staff to improve tissue recovery.

5. Ethical aspects. Does the manuscript have a paragraph on ethical aspects, where it mentions approval by the ethics committee, informed consent, and strict compliance with research ethics?

No

- The following paragraph was written to describe what was requested.

This article is still under revision for expedited review by the ethics committee of the "Hospital de Emergencias de Villa El Salvador" and followed the recommendations of the Declaration of Helsinki. Informed consent was obtained from the patient

6. Results: They are presented adequately and it is not redundant with tables or graphs shown.

Poor

Remarks

Result not declare in this manuscript.

The author stated "Three cultures for *Lactococcus garvieae* were obtained" in the abstract, but there are no photos of the cultured bacteria in the result.

- This article describes obtaining the microorganism in 3 samples, but photographs could not be obtained because they were discarded after their identification. However, the information on the strains was recorded in the Vitek-2 system.

7. Discussion: They present a level of critical analysis in correspondence with the problem presented. Purposes of the article, scope, support theory and proposed methodological design.

Regular

8. Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study.

Regular

9. References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format.

Regular

10. Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written? Does it contain any spelling or grammar mistakes?

Needs some language corrections

- Corrections: a better writing of the manuscript was made in general based on the recommendations of the reviewers.

11. Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it

The systematic writing of each point is not good. Must be adjusted to the guideline for author.

- Corrections: a better writing of the manuscript was made in general based on the recommendations of the reviewers.

Conclusiones:

- **- Multiple corrections are made in relation to grammar and syntax for a better understanding of the manuscript, based on the recommendations of the reviewers.**
- **- A better description of the sample obtaining process is carried out, as well as identification of the strains (Vitek-2 system).**
- **- A description of the clinical follow-up and patient interview is carried out, at the request of reviewers.**
- **- Crop table is modified, for better understanding and specifying that there were no cut-off points for the determination of susceptibility (description in the text)**