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The Editor
BMC Public Health

Sub.: Ms: 1066802644484799 - Submission of RE-REVISED manuscript for consideration of publication in the BMC Public Health

Sir,

Thank you very much for your letter and considering our manuscript positively. Also, I thank for the comments of the reviewer for refinement of the manuscript.

We are grateful to the Reviewer # 2 for his advice and offering us to visit his institute to seek his help for rewriting the manuscript. However, it is difficult to attend that institute as permissions (both financial and administrative) from the authority is not possible. Hence, based on the comments of Reviewer # 2 and # 1 (very minor), the paper has been revised. Please find herewith submitting the RE-REVISED VERSION of the manuscript ("Epidemiology of episodic adenolymphangitis: a longitudinal prospective surveillance among a rural community endemic for bancroftian filariasis in coastal Orissa, India").

I am herewith provided the point-to-point information to indicate where and how the revision has been made.

Reviewer 1 (Dr. James Kazura)

1. The reviewer pointed out that in Abstract, the incidence of ADL is shown to second decimal point, and he opined that it is inappropriate. Hence, the incidence is shown to one decimal point only.
2. As suggested, the manuscript is rechecked for language usage.

Reviewer 2 (Dr. Pradeep Kumar Das)

1. As suggested, the ‘filarial pathology’ is replaced by ‘chronic disease’ in ABSTRACT (ABSTRACT, line 10).
2. In BACKGROUND, the reviewer advised to write directly stating that the acute attack of ADL is one of the symptoms of filarial disease. Accordingly, it is rewritten (Page 2; BACKGROUND, lines 2-3).
3. In METHODS, the reviewer suggested to rewrite the sentence on the study district. Accordingly, it is rewritten (Page 3, paragraph 2, lines 8-10).
4. In DATA COLLECTION, the reviewer advised to describe the criteria for diagnosis. Accordingly, the criteria of diagnosis used in the present paper is described (Page 3, paragraph 3, lines 5-8).
5. The reviewer opined that the first sentence under FREQUENCY AND DURATION OF ACUTE EPISODES (in RESULTS) is too long and difficult to read. Hence this sentence is simplified (Page 5, paragraph 2, lines 1-5).

Reviewer 3 (Dr. Kapa D Ramaiah)

Not suggested to revise
I request you to consider this re-revised paper for publication in BMC Public Health.

With regards,

Sincerely

(B. V. Babu)