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Reviewer's report:

1. Line 122: In fact, the purpose of your study was aimed to explore the associated factors to clinical diagnosis of neurosyphilis other than risk factors of neurosyphilis.

2. Line 129: The abbreviation of "NS" should be given full name.

3. Line 129: Whether 50 patients in control group were general syphilis patients should be declared.

4. In the first paragraph in page 9, diagnosis details of 50 patients with neurosyphilis should be given. For example, how many patients were given confirmed neurosyphilis diagnosis using diagnosis criteria 1 and how many patients were diagnosed with neurosyphilis using diagnosis criteria 2 and 3.

5. Line 178-179: These explanatory notes were redundant because these abbreviations were described in Background and Methods parts.

6. Line 180-183, Line 191-192: These explanatory notes were also given in Statistical Analysis part.

7. In page 12, maybe ROC curve should be provided, which was more intuitive to describe the sensitivity and specificity.

8. Line 262-263: Sensitivity and specificity have been analyzed in your paper, why did you mention that sensitivity analysis can not be performed in your study?

9. Line 265: "Early diagnosis and treatment of neurosyphilis is of great significance." was a fact, which was not a conclusion due to your study.
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