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Response to Editor Comments:

April 23, 2019

Dear Dr.

Kevin Escandón-Vargas, MD MSc
HIV Expert
Research Fellow on Antibiotic Resistance - CIDEIM
Associate Editor - BMC Infectious Diseases
Bogotá, Colombia

Thank you for the opportunity to revise and resubmit our manuscript “Social and environmental conditions related to Mycobacterium leprae infection in children and adolescents from three leprosy endemic regions of Colombia” We greatly appreciate your detailed comments, constructive suggestions, and insights. We believe that the manuscript has been substantially improved after addressing the requested modifications.
Following this letter please find a point-by-point response to your review, including how and where the text was modified. All coauthors have participated in the revision, and each author has approved the final version of this revision.

ASSESSMENT OF REVISED VERSION 4 OF THE MANUSCRIPT
- Please update the abstract in the system; both abstracts (from system and manuscript) should be identical.
  
  R/ both abstracts are identical

- Correct "lerpae" in the conclusions subsection of the manuscript abstract.
  
  R/ it was corrected

- Page 3 Line 14: Change "and 27.3% increasing to this condition during their follow-up" to ", increasing to 27.3% during their follow-up".
  
  R/ it was changed

- Page 3 Line 56: delete "()".
  
  R/it was deleted

- Page 4 Line 39: abbreviate "household contact".
  
  R/ it was abbreviated according to your suggestion.

- Table 1: change "Years (range)" to "Average age (range), years".
  
  R/ it was changed according to your suggestion.

- Table 1: include HHC in the footnote of abbreviations.
R/It was included according to your suggestion.

- Table 2: change "P-Value" to "P-value".

R/it was changed

- Page 8 Line 8: change "<0.05" to ",=0.0001".

R/it was changed

- Page 8 Line 41: change "=0.001" to "<0.05".

R/it was changed

- Table 3: change "Status lower-lower" to "Low-low socioeconomic status".

R/it was changed according to your suggestion.

- Table 3: change "status socioeconomic low-low" to "low-low socioeconomic status".

R/it was changed according to your suggestion.

- Table 3: change "P-Value" to "P-value".

R/it was changed

- Table 4: change "P-Value" to "P-value".

R/it was changed

- Table 4: change "0,2" to "0.2".

R/it was changed
- Page 10 Line 48: change "had been received" to "had received".
R/it was changed

- Page 10 Line 57: change "anti-IgM" to "IgM", "anti-IgG" to "IgG".
R/it was changed

- Page 10 Line 57: correct p value for IgG, it is 0.007 (in Fig 2B), 0.016 (in the text).
R/this mistake was corrected

- Page 11 Line 12: change "MB" to "multibacillary (MB)".
R/it was changed according to your suggestion.

- Page 11 Line 16: change "PB" to "paucibacillary (PB)".
R/it was changed according to your suggestion.

- Page 11 Line 16-21: Again, this sentence does not read well: "Surprisingly, anti-NDO-LID antibodies detected by Protein A, IgM or IgG showed similar rates, however, when subjects were stratified by their residency with either MB or PB cases". Furthermore, in the supplementary table the variable "residency with MB/PB" is not analyzed. This does not make sense.
R/the sentence was re-wrote according to your suggestion.

- Table 5: change "0,8" to "0.8".
R/it was changed.

- Table 5: change "CI 95%" to "95% CI".
R/it was changed

- Table 5: change "exposition" to "exposure".
R/it was changed

- Table 5: place p value columns after 95% CI columns (not before).
R/it was changed according to your suggestion.

- Page 12 Lines 5-6: these p values are not the same as those in Table 5.
R/it was corrected.

- Page 14 Line 32: delete ",," after "population".
R/it was deleted

- Page 15 Line 15: delete ",," after "18".
R/it was deleted

- IN ALL TABLES: Change "CI" to "95% CI".
R/it was changed

----------

This is serious. Why OR estimates are not within the 95% CI?
This needs an explanation. I need you to run analysis again and correct accordingly.

Examples of these:

TABLE 4:  0.2 (0.59-0.67), 0.22 (0.68-0.72), 0.25 (0.46-1.4)
TABLE 5: All three estimates and CIs of "Time of exposure": 0.186 (0.3-1.1) 0.32 (0.68-15.6) 0.18 (0.19-1.8)

R/all the analysis were calculated again according to your suggestion. Results section included explanation about model.

------

- Fig 1: IgM graphic lacks p value.
R/ it was added

- Fig 1: change "0,032" to "0.032".
R/it was changed.

- Fig 1 legend: change "lower-lower" to "low-low".
R/it was changed

- Fig 1: all figures must have axis labels. y-axes in the nine graphics are fine. So please add x-axis labels for the six graphics (A: "Socioeconomic status", B: "Geographic region").
R/the axis labels were added according to your suggestion.

- Fig 2: add x-axis label "Armadillo meat intake" to Protein A graphic.
R/it was added

- Fig 3: change "Classification WHO" to "WHO classification" in the three A graphics.
R/ it was changed according to your suggestion.

- ABBREVIATIONS: change "contacts" to "contact".
R/it was changed.
- ABBREVIATION: use italics for "Mycobacterium leprae".
R/it was corrected.

- FUNDING: Regarding the comment in the previous revision, What BMC asks is to make clear that the funding body had /did not have a role in the research development. I suggest to rewrite this as "This project was funded by a grant to Nora Cardona-Castro. Also, Héctor Serrano-Coll had financial support from Colciencias (grant 727-2015). The funding bodies had no role in the design of the study, analysis, interpretation of data, and in writing the manuscript".
R/it was added according to your suggestion.

- Please add a section "Additional files" (after Figure legends) where you list: "Supplementary material Table 1: Binomial logistic analysis".
R/the section after figure legends “Additional files” was added and list the supplementary material.

YOU DELETED the "Consent for publication" and "Ethics approval and consent to participate" sections. Why? They are needed; they were good as they were written in Revised version 3.
R/We are so sorry about these mistakes. I submitted a wrong file.

THERE IS A MIX HERE. The suppl table is the same as table 5 in clean version, so it'r repeated???.
R/the mistake was corrected.

FURTHERMORE, Table 5 in manuscript version 3 (track changes version 3 was the last in which I saw this different table) and earlier was different. WHY? Please carefully revise. In my previous revision, I wrote this: "HERE ARE DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE CLEAN VERSION AND REVISED VERSION IN THE TEXT SECTION REGARDING RESULTS OF TABLE 5. YOU DELETED SEVERAL PARAGRAPHS AND CHANGED TABLE 5 WITHOUT INFORMING US. PLEASE EXPLAIN."
R/the reason about your concern is that I submitted a wrong file. I apologize for this mistake.