

Peer Review File

Article information: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tau-20-959>.

Review Comments

A. Brief summary

The authors report a review manuscript that aim to perform a meta-summary of the literatures to characterize and evaluate the efficacy and safety of tigecycline in patients with complicated urinary tract infection (cUTI). The main conclusion of the manuscript is that tigecycline has a favorable clinical response in cUTI, and in the patients who was confirmed clinical cure, vast majority observed bacteria eradication in urine culture with no recurrence. The analysis of results suggested that tigecycline failed in treatment of *K. pneumoniae* caused cUTI even with increased dose, and tigecycline monotherapy achieved better clinical results.

Reply: We thank the Reviewer for the positive comments about our study. We have followed your suggestions and made every possible effort to address the concerns. Detailed responses are below.

B. Broad comments

1. It is a easy to read manuscript in a very important clinical topic. However, some recommendations should be considered by the authors.

Reply: We thank the Reviewer for the positive comments about our study. The recommendations are very useful and we have revised the article as suggested, all the changes were marked with red text in our revised version.

2. It is suggested an extensive English review of the manuscript.

Reply: We thank the Editor for the comments, careful modifications have been made and the English is checked by language specialists. All changes were marked in red text.

3. Line 58. “were mainly caused by Klebsiella Pneumonia (K. pneumonia)”. The name of the microorganism is not well written. It should be replaced by “Klebsiella pneumoniae (K. pneumoniae)”.

Reply: Thank you for pointing out our spelling errors. The revised manuscript had replaced the incorrect words with “Klebsiella pneumoniae (K. pneumoniae)” as suggested.

1. Line 160. “diabetes mellites” should be replaced by “diabetes mellitus”.

Reply: Thanks again for correcting our clerical errors. We use “diabetes mellitus” in the revised manuscript as suggested.

5. Lines 163-164.

5.1. “Klebsiella Pneumonia (K. pneumonia) should be reviewed as previously mentioned.

5.2. Acinetobacter should be replaced by “Acinetobacter spp.”

Reply: “Klebsiella Pneumonia (K. pneumonia)” was replaced by “Klebsiella pneumoniae (K. pneumoniae)” as the comment above. The reviewed manuscript had corrected the name of the microorganism as suggested.

6. Lines 197-198. The phrase “K. pneumoniae might be the risk factor of clinical

failure and tigecycline monotherapy was the risk factor of clinical cure” should be reviewed. It is not clear.

Reply: We thank the Editor for the comments. The revised parts according to the comment were corrected as follows: Univariate analysis showed that pathogen K. pneumoniae might be the risk factor of clinical failure, and tigecycline monotherapy was related to clinical cure (P < 0.1). We also marked this part in red on lines 198-200.

7. Line 252. The comma is not in the right place and should be reviewed.

Reply: Thank you for the suggestion, the comma was removed in the revised manuscript.

8. Lines 282-286. The conclusion of the manuscript is not coincident with the conclusion of the abstract (lines 65-69) considering that is not mentioned the therapeutic failure associated with infections caused by K. pneumoniae, which is very relevant to clinical practice. It should be added to the conclusion of the manuscript.

Reply: As the reviewer suggested, the conclusion of the manuscript (lines 289-290) was added the result by Univariate analysis: if the cUTI was caused by K. pneumoniae, tigecycline might not be a good choice.

9. The references should be reviewed considered that the scientific names of the microorganisms and families are not italicize (as Enterobacteriaceae at the reference 1, Klebsiella pneumoniae at reference 8 and 9, Enterobacter aerogenes at reference 9, among others).

Reply: We quite appreciate the reviewers' comments about our references, the revised portions are marked in red and the related references were reference 1, 8,9,10,14,15,19,21,22,23,24,25,27,28,29,30.