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Dear Editor,

We are delighted to see the response of the editorial board and the reviewers comments suggesting that the article should be considered as high priority article. Enclosed is our response to their comments and the revised version of the manuscript.

Hoping for a favorable and prompt acknowledgment of the same.
REVIEWER 2: Comments

Figure 1. Due to the low magnification, it is impossible to ascertain if the area described as inflammatory infiltrate with microabscess formation as described is truly that. The low magnification serves well to locate the lesion anatomically but, perhaps, an insert at a higher magnification would add detail and solve this problem.

Reply – We agree with the reviewer’s suggestion to include a picture with higher magnification. We have now included a picture at lower and higher magnification to highlight the inflammatory infiltrates.

Figure 2. Fine details are also missing in this figure, in particular regarding the description of the polar filament that appears as a featureless spot.

Reply – We agree to the reviewer that polar filament (which is generally seen in ultrastructural studies) is not highlighted in the light microscopic picture. Our intention was to describe the characteristic darkly stained polar end/waist band that is highlighted in some of the stains. We have revised the figure and legend appropriately.

Figure 3. The fluorescence stains are of poor quality and non-contributory.

Reply – We agree with the reviewer comments. However our idea was to convey that the fluorescence stains that are preferred stains for diagnosis of microsporidiosis on smears of corneal scrapings, are not useful on tissue sections due to presence of background noise.

Figure 4. Since this work intends to establish the usefulness of certain stains in the detection of
microsporidia, images are the essential component of the manuscript and, in particular, images of
the two â€œbestâ€œ stains. Figure 4 fails to convey this impression, again due to low
magnification.

Reply – We believe that the picture is good and is the best one that we have taken. However
the magnification was not correctly represented in the legend, which has now been
rectified.
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