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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Devoto,

Please find attached our revised manuscript entitled “Susceptibility Testing of Leishmania spp. using the Sensititre™ YeastOne YO9 Platform”, which we wish to have considered for publication as a Technical Advance article in BMC ID. We thank you for the opportunity to revise our manuscript along the lines suggested in peer-review, and have responded to reviewer comments in a point-by-point fashion below.

Specific Comments, Editor:

1. Among several available drugs for the treatment of leishmaniasis, the current platform is able to test only two of them, amphotericin B and fluconazole. Therefore the title of the study should be modified to indicate the findings of the study. The appropriate title for the manuscript would be: Susceptibility Testing of Leishmania spp. against Amphotericin B and Fluconazole using the Sensititre™ YeastOne™ YO9 Platform.

RESPONSE: We thank the editor for this suggestion. We have amended the title accordingly.
2. From the data presented in the M and M section, it is not clear which country is making the Sensititre™ YeastOne™YO9 plates. RESPONSE: We thank the editor for requesting this clarification. The plates are manufactured by TREK Diagnostics in the United Kingdom. We have added this information.

3. Long sentences have been used in the manuscript. Just as an example, Line 217-221; the sentence about the promastigote assay, is too long and is difficult to follow and understand. RESPONSE: We thank the editor for noting this and have trimmed the text throughout for readability. We have particularly edited down the longer sentences.

4. Fig 1, as already pointed out by one of the reviewers, is not informative and could be omitted. RESPONSE: We thank the editor for this suggestion. We have removed the figure accordingly.

5. Fig 2 is really confusing and the data presented in the figure, at least in Fig 2 A, is different from those presented in the text. Moreover, it is of very important to include the level of significance and also the error bars in such figures. RESPONSE: We thank the editor for these suggestions, to which we have attended. With the removal of Figure 1, Figures 2A-D have been renumbered accordingly. Significantly different results have now been denoted. However, because these are neither means nor medians, rather, they are the number of isolates at each concentration, there are no error bars.

I hope that we have addressed the editor's concerns satisfactorily. All authors have seen and approved this version of the manuscript, all contributed significantly to the work, and none has a conflict of interest with its publication. This manuscript has not been previously published and is not being considered for publication elsewhere. Please contact me at your convenience should you require additional information. I look forward to corresponding with you further, and I thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Andrea K. Boggild, BSc, MSc, MD, DTMH, FRCPC
Medical Director, Tropical Disease Unit, Toronto General Hospital
Parasitology Lead, Public Health Ontario Laboratory
Associate Professor, Department of Medicine, University of Toronto