Dear Editor,

We would like to express our gratitude once again for your valuable comments and suggestions on our original article. We have carefully considered all of your observations and would like to provide a detailed response, taking into account the additional information regarding the objective and scope of our study.

The main objective of our original article was to conduct a methodological literature review to explore the prevalence of antibiotic resistance in *Stenotrophomonas maltophilia* and its role as an opportunistic infectious agent in nosocomial settings. Initially, we focused on presenting a detailed methodology for information search and selection, as well as providing a critical analysis of the selected studies.

However, based on the comments and suggestions from both reviewers, we have reflected on the focus of our article and have decided to make significant changes to its structure and content. We now believe that the article can be considered as an original research article or an original research paper.

Below, we present how we have addressed each specific point:

1. Relevance of the title: We appreciate Reviewer A's positive evaluation of the title's relevance. We will consider Reviewer B's suggestion to reflect on how the title conveys the relevance of the content and ensure that it is clear and accurate regarding the prevalence of antibiotic resistance in *Stenotrophomonas maltophilia* and the nature of the original research.

2. Abstract: We have taken into account Reviewer A's suggestion to be more concise and focused on the conclusions section in the abstract. We will ensure that the abstract objectively and succinctly presents the general idea of the topic, research objectives, methods, results, and conclusions.

3. Introduction: We appreciate Reviewer A's remarks regarding the need to include the research gap and study justification in the introduction. We will review and expand the introduction section to address these concerns and clearly explain the rationale of the research, the importance of the problem, and the findings in the context of antimicrobial resistance.

4. Methodology: Since we have changed the focus of our article from a methodological literature review to an original research article, we will modify the methodology section to present our own research methodology. We will provide a detailed description of the study design, data collection and analysis, and any other relevant information about how we conducted our original research.

5. Ethical aspects: We appreciate Reviewer A's observation regarding the need to include a paragraph on ethical aspects. We will add a paragraph in the article that mentions ethical committee approval, informed consent, and compliance with research ethics, according to established ethical protocols for the original research.

6. Results: We have considered Reviewer A's suggestion to include the prevalence data from individual studies in Table 1 and improve the presentation of the figures to avoid
redundancies. We will review and enhance the presentation of our own research results, ensuring the inclusion of relevant prevalence data and eliminating any redundancy in the figures.

7. Discussion: We appreciate Reviewer A's remarks about the need for a more detailed and step-by-step discussion of the research findings. We will improve the discussion section to provide a critical and detailed analysis of our own findings in relation to the study objectives, scope, and implications of antimicrobial resistance.

8. Conclusions: We will take into account Reviewer A's suggestion to make the conclusions more concise and focused, providing a single paragraph that encompasses all the valuable information with recommendations based on our own research results.

Overall, we sincerely appreciate your time and dedication in reviewing our original article. We value your feedback and are committed to making the suggested improvements. We believe that these changes will allow us to transform our original article into a more solid and coherent original research article. We are grateful for the opportunity to improve and look forward to submitting an improved version of our article in the near future.

Sincerely,

Galo Guillermo Farfan Cano (corresponding author)