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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers’ comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Prevalence of intestinal parasitic infections in Eastern China: a cross-sectional survey conducted in 2015” (INFD-D-18-01531R2). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. Revised portion are marked in revisions mode in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the point-by-point response to the reviewer’s comments are as following:
Reviewer #1:

1. Comment: The title is rather surprising as it mentions the prevalence of intestinal parasitic infections in Eastern China, which seems quite ambitious.

Response: It is really true as reviewer’s suggestion, and we have changed the title with “in Jiangsu Province, Eastern China”. Also, we have changed the key words.

2. Comment: Why were protozoans exclusively looked for in rural sites?

Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s comments. The reason for exclusively looking for protozoans in rural sites was that infection of intestinal protozoans was more related with poor sanitation in rural areas.

3. Comment: Why was the prevalence of Clonorchis sinensis in animals assessed, including second intermediate hosts and reservoir hosts in urban sites?

Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s comments. The reason for assessing the prevalence in animals (including second intermediate hosts and reservoir hosts) was that we would like to investigate the infection situation of Clonorchis sinensis in animals and assess the infection risk for humans.

4. Comment: Very surprising is the fact that only one fecal sample per individual was collected but they were not adequately fixed.

Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s comments. The reason for not fixing for fecal sample was that we collected the fecal sample and detected immediately.

5. Comment: How was F. buski separated from Fasciola, Echinostoma, etc.

Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s reminding. In the present survey, we detected the eggs in fecal sample also combined with the epidemiological history when positive sample was detected.
6. Comment: No data with respect to the helminth intensity is provided, and the reference used by the authors of the Ms (nº 29) should be changed to a more precise reference, i.e. the authors who created the guidelines (Montresor et al., 1998).

Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s reminding. We are very sorry for our incorrect citing of the reference and we have changed to a more precise reference (Montresor, A., Compton, D. W. T., Hall, A., Bundy, D. A. P. & Savioli, L. Guidelines for the Evaluation of Soil-Transmitted Helminthiasis and Schistosomiasis at Community Level, WHO, 1998).

7. Comment: Even more curious is the fact that Blastocystis hominis cyst was only found in one fecal sample.

Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s reminding. The fact is that Blastocystis hominis cyst was only found in one fecal sample in present survey. The staff members of the Jiangsu Institute of Parasitic Diseases do not revise the results.

8. Comment: Actually, the most significant thing is the intestinal parasite spectrum detected; and, this spectrum should be dealt with in relation to different sites, different areas, different income levels etc.

Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s suggestion. We have added the results of intestinal parasite spectrum detected in different areas (shown as Supplementary Figure 1).

9. Comment: Finally, the significant fall of the 2015 prevalence detected in this Ms should be related to previous studies (1990 and 2002) and the possible reason for this should be looked for.

Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s advice and the possible reason of the significant fall of the 2015 prevalence will be looked for in the near future with another manuscript.

10. Comment: In fact, they mention that 18 species of human parasites were detected in 1990, but nothing is said about the number of species found in 2002.

Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s reminding. We have added the number of species found in 2002 in the MS.

Special thanks to you for your good comments.
Reviewer #2:

1. Comment: Page 3, lines 49 - 52: replace the statement that reads "Due to the comprehensive measures were carried out throughout province and the prevalence was decreased dramatically in the followed ten years (9.28% in 2002)." with "Due to the comprehensive measures taken throughout the province, the prevalence dramatically decreased to 9.28% in 2002."

Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s advice and we have revised in the MS.

2. Comment: Page 3, line 52: better to replace the word understand with "assess".

Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s advice and we have revised in the MS.

3. Comment: Page 3, lines 64 & 65: Replace the statement that reads "It was showed that 115 out of 30153 participants (0.38% infection rate) were positive infection with intestinal helminth or protozoa." with "It was shown that 115 out of 30153 participants (0.38% infection rate) had intestinal helminths or protozoa."

Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s advice and we have revised in the MS.

4. Comment: Page 4, line 70: delete "was"; Line 73: better to replace "which" with "who".

Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s advice and we have revised in the MS.

5. Comment: Page 4, line 78: replace "in Jiangsu Province in eastern China has decreased dramatically to 0.38%." with "in Jiangsu Province in eastern China decreased from 71.57% in 1990 to 0.38% in 2015."

Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s advice and we have revised in the MS.

6. Comment: Page 7, line 147: Delete "s" in helps.

Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s advice and we have revised in the MS.
7. Comment: Page 8, line 161: better to replace the word "understand" with "assess".
Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s advice and we have revised in the MS.

8. Comment: Page 8, lines 173 - 176: In the method section, what was the basis for selecting at least 250 permanent residents? This should be clarified and reference cited if needed.
Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s advice and we have revised in the MS.

Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s advice and we have revised in the MS.

10. Comment: Page 11, lines 227 - 229: The statement that reads "Participants with under 6 years of age were collected from the parents, also participants with 6-16 years of age were collected from themselves of written." needs re-writing for clarity.
Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s advice and we have revised in the MS.

11. Comment: Page 14, line289: add "s" to helminth to make it plural.
Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s advice and we have revised in the MS.

12. Comment: Page 14, line298: the heading "Human infection rates in different cities, areas and over time" may be corrected to read "Human infection rates in different prefecture-level cities".
Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s advice and we have revised in the MS.

13. Comment: Page 17, lines 371 - 373: In a statement that reads "These data could provide a better understanding of the current state of intestinal parasitic infections, as well as important information for implementing control measures in the near future", "implementing control measures in the near future" is stated as one of the significances of the results. On the other hand, on page 8, lines 156 to 161, it has been indicated that comprehensive measures have been put in place. The authors need to reconcile the two statements that seem contradictory.
Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s advice and we have revised in the MS.
14. Comment: Page 20, line 423: delete the word "were".
Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s advice and we have revised in the MS.

15. Comment: Page 21, line 447: replace "in eastern China has decreased dramatically to 0.38%." with "in eastern China decreased from 71.57% in 1990 to 0.38% in 2015."
Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s advice and we have revised in the MS.

16. Comment: Page 28, lines 597&598: In legend of Table 1, …prefecture-level city… should be corrected as …prefecture-level cities…
Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s advice and we have revised in the MS.

Special thanks to you for your good comments.

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper. And here we did not list the changes but marked in red in revised paper.

We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers’ warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.