Dear editor,

Please find enclosed a modified version of my journal article titled “Dr. Matthew Cabeen and Pseudomonas aeruginosa”. To address the concerns and comments raised by the three reviewers, I have made the following adjustments to improve and clarify the article. I hope that these changes make the article acceptable for publication in Microreviews in Cell and Molecular Biology.

Sincerely,

Joni Seiler

**Reviewer A:**

1. I was glad to see some positivity about my overall article, but I did not totally agree with all the points that were made. Knowing that the flow and topic of my paper were solid helped me know where my strength was and that was reassuring overall.
2. I did not make all of the changes that the reviewer asked when he stated that “this manuscript does not seem like it came from an interview with a person as it is not very personable” because I feel like I gave a solid background on Dr. Cabeen without it taking up the entire article length. To kind of remedy this I added sentences to the final paragraph. I did however change a bit more in that paragraph when the reviewer stated that they did not have an easy time figuring out the purpose of the research, because that is important. This was very helpful to me during my reviewing process.

**Reviewer B:**

1. This reviewer was overall very positive about the article, and reassured me that what I had was a strong piece which I appreciate. It was also helpful to hear what they think is missing and what I should add which will be taken under consideration.
2. The comment that was made about adding information about Dr. Cabeen was understood, and I added some information in order to give more of an understanding. I also slightly edited the sentence “This research has many practical applications..” like the reviewer stated in order for it to come off in a seemingly nicer way. Overall the review was very helpful to my editing process.

**Reviewer C:**

1. Reviewer C did not offer very much commentary on revisions, but did present the idea of changing the font and removing some portions of the article. This was slightly helpful, though I did not agree with the point of removing a portion.
2. I did change the font of my paper like advised, because I agree that a times new roman font is much more common in an article style format. I did not remove the portion of the text stating that it is a “dumbed down version” because I think it is important for people to know that there is more to it than I had stated for those interested.