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Reviewer's report:

Cruz et al A canine leishmaniasis pilot survey in an emerging focus of visceral leishmaniasis: Posadas (Misiones, Argentina).

This is a manuscript that I reviewed previously. The authors addressed all my previous comments and I believe the revised manuscript has certainly improved.

Below, whether my original comments have been addressed – please refer to original numbering of comments.

MAJOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS / COMMENTS

1. Results of the statistical analysis should be moved to the results section rather than being presented in the Discussion section. Furthermore the section could be expanded, by testing the association of infection with dog age or sex, origin, and even symptomatic vs polysymptomatic status.

Section was moved in revised manuscript. Tables included showing additional information.

2. Authors should expand the section outlining the caveats of their analyses and the results presented. For example, authors should mention the possibility of other parasites, e.g. L. braziliensis and Trypanosoma cruzi, to cross-react with antigen used in serological tests.

OK – addressed.

3. The manuscript could be improved significantly if authors include a flowchart indicating number of samples processed, number of samples testing positive with one, two, three or four diagnostic approaches (rk39 RDT, IFAT, PB PCR and Ln PCR) used.

Flowchart included in revised manuscript; Table also added.

4. Although I know that English is not the authors’ native language, I suggest the authors ask a native English speaker to review manuscript, as there are several grammatical and spelling errors and at times it is not clear what authors try to convey to the reader. Some examples are outlined below.

OK.
MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS / COMMENTS

Abstract
5. OK.

Introduction
6. OK.

Methods
7. OK.
8. OK.
9. OK.
10. Not done – justification given is that the work was a pilot study.
11. OK.
12. OK.

Results
13. OK.

Discussion
14. OK.

Authors contribution
15. OK.
16. OK.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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