Belo Horizonte, January 23th, 2021

To Microbes, Infection and Chemotherapy
Dear Editor Kovy Arteaga-Livias

We are sending the manuscript revised, and entitled **"Identification of *Salmonella enterica* serovar Typhi strain from a young Brazilian patient: the relevance of automated microbiological methods for the rapid diagnosis of systemic infections"** authored by Max Roberto Batista Araújo, Luisa Ferreira Seabra, Lincoln Oliveira Sant'Anna and Louisy Sanches dos Santos.

First, we would like to thank the reviewers of this study who provided valuable suggestions and very pertinent comments, thus helping to improve the quality of our munuscript. After a detailed analysis of the comments and questions, as well as the errors pointed out and suggestions contained in the opinions sent to us, the article underwent some changes, which are indicated below.

Kind regards,
Max Roberto Batista de Araújo

Reviewer B

Question 01: 1. Relevance of the title to the content of the article: Good. Remarks:

The word "prompt" can be replaced with "rapid".

Answer: Was replaced. Line 04.

Question 02: 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: Good. Remarks: The sentence from line 87, please correct "05 years" to full number (like 50).

Answer: Was replaced. Line 86.

Question 03: References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format: Regular. Remarks: Reference 13 could not be found at the link address. The link address of the reference number 13 should be written in more detail.

Answer: Was replaced. Lines 223 to 225. Data made available through search on the portal. Synthesized in table 1.

Question 04: Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it. The work is interesting and appropriately designed. However, some changes are necessary for a better understanding of the study.

Answer: Changes made throughout the manuscript. Insertion of recent data and a greater contextualization with other works.

Reviewer C

Question 01: Relevance of the title to the content of the article: Regular. Remarks: The title included the word "case report". The title is too long, it should be more synthetic and original.

Answer: Was replaced. Lines 03 to 05.

Question 02: 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 summary is not structured in sections. No clear conclusions are given. MALDI-TOF MS is not a MeSH term.

Answer: Was replaced. Line 24.

Question 03: Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner: Regular. Remarks: The introduction is too long, it must be synthesized. Nor is there any reference to why this case is unique and particular. It does not indicate relevant past interventions or medical history. It does not including other diagnoses considered.

Answer: Was replaced. Lines 29 to 54. Including to work described in the reference 14.

Question 04: Results: They are presented adequately and it is not redundant with tables or graphs shown: Regular. Remarks: The format of the figure could be improved so that it can be read better.

Answer: Was replaced. The figures separated. Lines 284 to 292.

Question 05: 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: A more in-depth discussion could be done. Comparison with other countries in the region, in the world. Also discuss the current model and mechanisms with more modern techniques already implemented. The strengths and limitations of this study are not included.

Answer: Was replaced. Lines 81 to 157. Including studies described in the new references 19 to 25.

Question 06: Conclusions: Presents the author's inferences and teachings in relation to the investigated topic, it must correspond to the objectives of the study: Poor. Remarks: They should be presented in a separate paragraph and be more concise.

Answer: Was replaced. Lines 158 to 166.

Question 07: References. Quality of bibliographic references and if they are in accordance with the Vancouver format: Poor. Remarks: References do not follow the same standard, it is recommended to use Vancouver. On the other hand, in the citation, they are too clustered (for example 1 to 7). It is recommended that they can be broken down into the scientific evidence that is incorporated into the text.

Answer: Was replaced. Lines 182 to 270.

Question 08: Redaction. Is the manuscript correctly written? Does it contain any spelling or grammar mistakes? Needs some language corrections.

Answer: Was replaced. Alterated in yellow color.

Question 09: Contributions. What are the main weaknesses of the manuscript and how the author can do to improve it: The main changes and modifications that are required: Some aspects of format (already indicated in the comments) and other basic ones (such as making the bibliographic references correctly); Find a greater number of bibliographic evidence and its comparison, analysis, breakdown; Strengths and limitations of the study; Compare with other clinical cases; Being able to show the results in a more graphic way.

Answer: Was replaced. Thank you for your commentaries and suggestions.

Reviewer D

Answer: Thank you for you appreciation.