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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors new and well defined?
   Yes - this paper has been tightened up with a focus on duration of symptoms, delay in diagnosis and distance from a medical facility

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described, and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
   Yes - I should like the authors to identify abbreviations at the first use and where a term is only used once there is no need for an abbreviation to be given. RBPT is used without indicating what it means. They do not say what the c in c-ELISA stands for - they should do so.

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
   Now they are but I should like clarity as follows - in the para headed Site of First Treatment the authors say "43 (87.7%)" now this is clearly not a percentage of 98 that they refer to in Para 1 of the results section so I should like them to say what the 49 which is the denominator of this percentage calculation comes from. I looked again at the paper and cannot see its origin

May I draw attention here to a spelling mistake - "likelyhood" should be spelt "likelihood" in the last line of the Para Headed "Factors responsible for patient delay"

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes
   They use "stay" in a Scottish way meaning "live" and so they might wish to say "live" rather than "stay" - see para 1 of discussion.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes

7. Is the writing acceptable?
   Yes subject to the nits I've picked above.