

## **Response to Editor**

**Title: Rapid Tests' Sensitivity and Specificity for Chagas disease' diagnosis at a referral center in Brazil: Rapid Tests' Sensitivity and Specificity**

**Dear Editor,**

**Thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to address the reviewers' comments. We also thank the reviewers for their diligent work reviewing the manuscript. We have revised the manuscript in order to meet reviewer's suggestions. Changes were addressed point by point below and marked in yellow in the manuscript. We hope the paper is clearer now and suitable for publication in Microbes Infect Chemother. Please, feel free to contact me in case of any addition doubt.**

**Sincerely yours,**

**Alejandro Marcel Hasslocher-Moreno, MD PhD**

Reviewer A:

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

Regular. The work sensitivity and specificity of rapid tests for the diagnosis of Chagas disease in a reference center in Brazil, deals with the comparison of several diagnostic kits where the specificity and sensitivity of the tests are evaluated.

*Response: The title was changed to improve clarity.*

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.

*Response: Thank you for the comment.*

3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner

Good.

*Response: Thanks for the comment. Funding information is included in the manuscript.*

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

Poor. The authors should implement a little more about the characteristics of the kits used, what antigen they have ... etc.

*Response: We thank the reviewer for this comment. We have included the information about the kits used for diagnosis of CD. In addition, more information about the statistical procedures performed in the study were included.*

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?

Yes

*Response: Thank you.*

6. Results:

Poor. The authors should rely on tables that allow evidence of the results, since they only show them in a statistically descriptive way. Furthermore, they should reveal whether there were any discordant samples between the kits used and make the relevant associations that this type of study entails.

*Response: Unfortunately, we do not have information about the diagnostic kits used for each patient. We recognize this lack of information as a study limitation and it was included in the discussion section. A table demonstrating the concordant and discordant results was included in the manuscript (Table 1).*

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. The discussion is poor, it would be much more nourished if they considered including the discordant samples obtained in their results.

*Response: We appreciate the reviewer for this comment. Please, see response #6.*

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

Poor. This is due to the limited results presented.

*Response: The conclusion was improved in order to better address the results presented in the study.*

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

Good.

*Response: Thank you.*

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

Acceptable.

*Response: English was reviewed to improve clarity.*

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

The authors should incorporate some table that can be visually kind to the reader, they should state if they have the presence of discordant samples, which I am sure there were.

*Response: We included a table with the main results to facilitate the results comprehension by the readers.*

-----

Reviewer B:

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

Good. Sensitivity and Specificity of rapid tests used at INI-Fiocruz for the diagnosis of chronic Chagas disease. Please introduce the word "chronic" in the title.

*Response: The title was changed to improve clarity.*

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. It should be included that RDTS should be used as secondary alternative tests for confirmation of chronic Chagas disease.

*Response: This required information was included in the manuscript.*

3. Introduction: Presentation of the subject, justification of the problem, objectives, hypotheses and methodological foundation, exposing the subject in an orderly and detailed manner

Good.

*Response: Thank you.*

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

Regular. No statistical analysis is mentioned.

*Response: We appreciate the comments. A description of statistical analysis was included in the manuscript.*

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?

Yes

*Response: Thank you.*

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

Good. The results and basic data are adequately described, no redundant information.

*Response: Thank you.*

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. The findings are well interpreted.

*Response: Thank you.*

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. The conclusions are based on the findings of the study.

*Response: Thank you.*

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

Good. The references are up- to-date.

*Response: Thank you.*

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

Acceptable.

*Response: English was reviewed to improve clarity.*

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

The authors must mention whether any statistical methods were applied to the study.

*Response: A description of statistical analysis was included in the manuscript, as suggested by the reviewer.*