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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the second revised version of the article titled “Imported Loiasis in France: an analysis of 167 cases with comparison between sub-Saharan and non sub-Saharan African patients”.

We responded point by point to all reviewers' comments. We agree with all the comments made and have amended the text accordingly (see below).

I guarantee that all authors approved the final manuscript.

Hoping that you will find this work worthy of being published in BMC Infectious diseases, on behalf of co-authors I address respectful greetings.

Olivier Bouchaud, MD, Ph D

Reviewer 1 :
- Comment 1 : we agree that this sentence may be not clear. To clarify, we changed the sentence
in “Among patients with a definite diagnosis (i.e. proven by positive microfilaremia) and also with positive serology, the serology sensitivity was estimated at 69 %.
- Comment 2 : as requested by the reviewer "due to the parasite lysis" ( line 306) has been deleted

Reviewer 3 :
We agree with the reviewer's general comment, particularly with regard to the standardization of serologic techniques and the limitations of our study.
- Comment 1 (methods): "and/or a clinical presentation compatible with a loiasis" refers to the clinical judgment of the practitioner. There was no score or minimum number of symptom associations, but the symptoms had to be suggestive of loiasis. Isolated itching was not considered a symptom suggestive enough to be retained.
- Comment 2 (methods) : we recognize that the description of serologies can be complex to understand due to the diversity of techniques used in different centres. As indicated in this sentence, at least 2 different techniques were performed, the first being a screening technique and the second a confirmation technique. To retain that a serology was positive, at least 2 tests had to be positive, the first using a screening technique and the second using a confirmation technique. The different combinations of these 2 types of tests are detailed in the following sentence in the article. To clarify that it took 2 different positive tests, the first being a screening and the second one a confirmation test, for a serology to be considered positive, we added in the article 1/ between the 2 sentences: “Thus serology was considered positive if at least 2 tests were positive, the first being a screening and the second one a confirmation test”, and 2/ “screening and confirmation” in the sentence “According to this rule, the different combinations of techniques were as follows” which gives as final text “According to this rule, the different combinations of screening and confirmation techniques were as follows : …”.
- Comment 3 (methods): we effectively omitted the test used for continuous variables and added the Mann-Whitney test in the sentence on statistical tests
- Comment 4 (results) : we agree on the value of this information. For patients for whom serology and microfilaremia result are available, 24 patients had positive microfilaremia and negative serology, 44 had negative microfilaremia and positive serology and 46 had microfilaremia and positive serology. These data have been added to the manuscript in the result section following the results of the diagnostic tests (line 176).
- Comment 5 (results) : sex ration male/female was 1.01 (added in the manuscript).
- Comment 6 (results) : This comment is all the more justified as the other reviewer did the same: we have therefore modified the text for greater clarity.
- Comment 7 (results) : No post-treatment reactions were reported in patients who received preventive treatment with anti-histaminic and/or corticosteroids. This clarification has been added to the text. Due to the retrospective nature of the study, we do not have more details on the respective effects of anti-histaminic and corticosteroids.
- Comment 8 (discussion) : we agree with this remark and have amended the text accordingly.
- Comment 9 (conclusion) : we added “for treating imported loiasis” to clarify this last sentence