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Reviewer’s report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Still the manuscript needs some revisions and clarifications. The study is not easy to follow up. In results, authors mention that in 115/127 samples they obtained concordant results when compared PanBio IgM/IgG results with the four tests used for confirmation (paragraph 3). However, later analysis shows some discordant results. According to this only in 64 samples (instead of 115) dengue was confirmed according criteria established by authors. Because this incongruence, it’s not easy to understand the discussion

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

A negative PCR not necessarily indicates a non dengue infection
Rash as thrombocytopenia is observed only in a number of dengue cases. In many dengue patients both are not observed

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No
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