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Dear Madam,

I have the honor to submit our research entitled 'Acceptability of local made baits for oral vaccination of dogs against rabies in the Philippines'. Herewith is the revised manuscript and I look forward to the publication of this noble undertaking in our country.

The point by point response to the reviewers comments:

Version: 1 Date 30 August 2001
Reviewer: Dr. D David
The aim of this work was to determine the best and the cheaper baits for oral vaccination of dogs in the Philippines. The results show that bait based on boiled intestine was the most accepted by the dogs. The writing of manuscript is acceptable and the conclusions are adequately supported by the data shown. However, the material and method section is too long and need revision, and sub-division according to topics/assays.
Response:- the material and method is shortened into Methods, some long sentences shortened and separated into paragraphs according to topics.
Version: 1 Date: 14 Sept 2001
Reviewer: Dr. Cathleen Hanlon
1. Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown: Yes, the tables are descriptive and statistical tests need not to be applied in this type of research simply because this is a pioneer study and definitely first in Asia, in other words no comparative statistical analysis is available.
2. Are sufficient details provided to allow replication of the work or comparison with related analyses? Yes (Answered by the reviewer).
3. Does the manuscript adhere to relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes (Answered by the reviewer)
4. Is the writing acceptable? All corrections regarding this, as suggested by the reviewer is incorporated in the revised manuscript.
Version: 1 Date 13 August 2001
Reviewer: Dr. Malcomb Fearnehough
1. (Minor) ......It would seem important to include a cost estimate for labor, storage and distribution of the final product, even if those estimates are determined to be small.
2. (Minor) ......Therefore, the cost for refrigeration should be mentioned as program consideration.
3. (Major) ..........Are cooking temperatures and cooking times adequate to kill potential pathogens in the bait material?
4. (Major) ..........There should be definition of the size, shape and thickness of the plastic film used in the empty vaccine container and the mechanism used to secure the vaccine container in the bait material.
5. ..........Were the vaccine containers recovered to verify P, NP, SW, and SW/P classification or was the evaluation process only visual from a distance?
Response: All answers to these questions are added to the different sections of the revised manuscript. In summary, all suggestions and answers to the reviewers queries were incorporated in the revised manuscript. Material and Methods deemed too long were revised into one section (Methods).

In summary, all answers to questions were incorporated in the revised manuscript. The Materials and Methods deemed too long are shortened to Methods. Long sentences are also shortened while the suggested wordings were also incorporated. Cells were made for the tables and some numbers were deleted in the text to conform with the reference consecutively.

Sincerely,
Roland Q. Estrada, MS AnSc,DVM
Research Leader