To,

The Editor-in chief

Microbes, Infection and Chemotherapy

Subject: Submission of the revised manuscript

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for your consideration, reviewing and valuable comments of the referee(s) for the manuscript entitled " ACINETOBACTER LWOFII, AN UNUSUAL CAUSE OF INFECTIOUS PERICARDITIS COMPLICATED WITH CARDIAC TAMPONADE: A CASE REPORT." which we submitted to your esteemed journal 'Microbes, Infection and Chemotherapy'. We greatly appreciate the constructive comments. We have now addressed these comments, and this has strengthened the paper. We would request you to please review the document being as we have modified the text as required with the track changes review mode in corrected manuscript file to facilitate the work for the reviewers as below.

Author Contribution Statement incorporated in the corrected manuscript file as-
The authors confirm contribution to the paper as follows: study conception and design: María Clara Ospino Guerra, Dinno Fernández Chica; data collection: Jessica Ospino Guzmán, Esteban Morales Díaz; analysis and interpretation of results: Dinno Fernández Chica, Esteban Morales Díaz; draft manuscript preparation: María Clara Ospino Guerra, Jessica Ospino Guzmán. All authors reviewed the results and approved the final version of the manuscript. All authors agree to be responsible for all aspects of the work to ensure the accuracy and integrity of the published manuscript.

Author replies to comments of the reviewers are as follows:

Reviewer B:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

---

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

Good

Remarks

The title is relevance to the content except that are little observation were made, the title should read as follows: ACINETOBACTER LWOFFII AN UNUSUAL CAUSE OF INFECTIVE PERICARDITIS COMPLICATED WITH CARDIAC TAMPONADE: A CASE REPORT.

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers. The changes were made.

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.

Good

Remarks

The authors follow some of the guidelines of the journal but need to improve

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers. We improved the way we present the general idea, and the research methods were added.

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

Remarks

There are poor presentation of introduction and methodology

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers. We improved the redaction of the presentation and justification of the problem

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

Poor

Remarks

The methodology was not clearly stated to show that the bacteria in question were isolated from such patient not a contaminant. The author needs to clearly state the methods used in isolating the bacteria in replica.

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers. We specify the isolation method and the sampling collection method

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

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers. The paragraph with ethical aspects was added.

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

Good

Remarks

Author clarification to the Reviewer’s Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers.

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.

Good

Remarks

Author clarification to the Reviewer’s Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers.

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

Good

Remarks

Author clarification to the Reviewer’s Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers.

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

Good

Remarks

all the references need to follow s single references system not mix up as stated in the authors guideline

Author clarification to the Reviewer’s Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers, we correct the citation method.

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

Needs some language corrections

Author clarification to the Reviewer’s Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers. Grammar was checked.

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

the main weakness of this manuscript is poor literature review and author did not demonstrate the method used to convince us that bacteria is the actual cause of the disease in question not a contaminant

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers. We amplified the literature review and specified the sampling and isolation method and the most probable causes were ruled out, including tuberculosis and neoplasms.

Reviewer C:
Recommendation: Revisions Required

---

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

Regular

Remarks

Interesting description of pericarditis in general. A typical case of hemodynamic instability due to pericarditis is shown. Although it is true that the germ found is rare, how can you prove that the result of the culture was not due to contamination? Knowing that TB is a common cause of pericarditis in our setting, was a culture for TB performed? Were there results from a pericardial biopsy?

Author clarification to the Reviewer's Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers. We specified the sampling and isolation method and the most probable causes were ruled out, including tuberculosis and neoplasms, the results from the pericardial biopsy were negative for atypias and we added it to the case report.

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

In general, the case is well described.

Author clarification to the Reviewer’s Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers.

3. 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

Author clarification to the Reviewer’s Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers.

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

Regular

Remarks

Author clarification to the Reviewer’s Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers. We add the research method and the techniques used in data collection.

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

Author clarification to the Reviewer’s Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers. The ethical aspect’s paragraphs was added.

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

Regular

Remarks

Author clarification to the Reviewer’s Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers. We improved the way we present the results.

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

- Author clarification to the Reviewer’s Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers. We improved the analysis and extended the literature review.

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

- Author clarification to the Reviewer’s Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers.

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

Regular

Remarks

- Author clarification to the Reviewer’s Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers.

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

Needs some language corrections

Author clarification to the Reviewer’s Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers. Grammar was double checked.

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

The author must clearly support how the condition he describes is due to a rare bacterial infection, since pericarditis is most commonly viral or due to TB. It is essential to have pericardial biopsy results to rule out neoplasia

Author clarification to the Reviewer’s Comments: Thanks for the appreciation by the reviewers. The most probable causes, including tuberculosis and neoplasms (Culture and RT-PCR for M. Tuberculosis were negatives, tomography and tumor markers were also negative), were ruled out by the infectious disease team.

We hope our revised version will be received favorably and look forward to hearing from you soon

Thanking you,

María Clara Ospino Guerra
Corresponding Author