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Author's response to reviews:

To,
The Editor,
BMC Neurology.

Sir/Madam,
Please find enclosed the revised copy of the manuscript entitled Differential Diagnosis of Tuberculous meningitis from partially treated cases of pyogenic meningitis by Cell ELISA. (MS: 167725575031837) with the point by point explanation of the reviewers report.

Thanks
Dr. H.F.Daginawala.

Sr. Research Consultant in Biochemistry
CIIMS, Nagpur-10.India.

Reviewers report
(Revision as suggested has been incorporated which are as follows)

1. The method section............................selected retrospectively.

The method section has been revised. The details regarding hospital setting and selection of patients are included in the manuscript.

2. Were all the..............................................anti- tuberculosis treatment.

The CSF specimens from TBM patients were taken before the start of anti TB medication.

3. The diagnostic criteria.............................with PTPM.

The diagnostic criteria for the selection of TBM and PTPM are included in the manuscript.

4. More clinical data.................................would be helpful.
The clinical data of all 24 patients of TBM/PTPM patients are included in Table-1.

5. The concentration of glucose................................. are not given.

CSF:blood glucose ratio of all 24 patients are included and given in Table-1.

6. All the clinical.................................................in one table.

All the clinical data as suggested presented in one table.

7. It is unclear whether........................................of the results.

30 Kd protein used for challenging lymphocytes was not taken from 12 TBM patients included in this study but was prepared from other other AFB positive TBM patients.

8. Please clarify.............................................was prepared.

The antigen preparation has been included in the method section.

9. The results section.............................. reference to 92 patients.

The result section including figures and table has been corrected.

10. The confusion continues ......................... suggested in the text.

Table-3 in the earlier manuscript has been deleted.

11. The authors conclusion...............................be explained.

The criteria for obtaining the cut off value of the absorbance is incorporated in the result section of the manuscript.

12. The authors..............................................not 93%.

The specificity percentage has been corrected.

Minor essential revisions.

13. The mislabeling......................................stated above.

The minor corrections in the tables and figures have been incorporated.

Discretionary revisions.

14. Please.............................not just percentages.

The absolute number along with percentage are incorporated both in abstract and the text.

15. Cut para..............................for this discussion.

The para 3 has been shortened. A minor revision has been incorporated in the discussion section.