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Reviewer's report:

The authors present a retrospective review of cases of loiasis diagnosed by parasitologic and serologic methods as well as the outcomes of treatment. The study is limited by the lack of standardized diagnostics available at that time, but still presents information valuable for a tropical medicine provider. Additional attention should be paid to addressing the limitations of the study.

Particular comments:

Methods:
- For inclusion criteria, the authors state, "and/or a clinical presentation compatible with a loiasis". Was this just based on the clinician's interpretation or do the authors have set criteria as to what counts as clinically compatible presentation? If so, were there a set number of required symptoms? In other words, was itching alone considered clinical evidence or did patients need to have other compatible symptoms?
- The section on serologic testing needs clarification. The sentence starting 'Different techniques of serology were used. . .." is unclear. How many tests were done and/or required to be positive to confirm a case?
- Understanding that the initial statisticians are gone, the authors should try to confirm whether Chi2 was the only test of significance. This was likely not the case for variables with continuous outcomes (e.g, eosinophils or microfilaremia).

Results
- It would be helpful for the reader to know how many had microfilaremia and serologic confirmation vs each test alone.
- Minor points: clarify the sex ratio in first paragraph of results (male:female?)
- This sentence is not clear "Among patients with both positive microfilaremia and serology, the serology sensitivity was estimated at 69 %." Do they mean among those who had either test done?
- Can the authors provide more information re the efficacy of treatment with antihistamines/steroids.

Discussion
- Further discussion of the limitations is warranted. In particular, the lack of standardized information on which test was used, the different cut-points at different institutions, and the potential for some misclassification of cases (for those diagnosed by serology alone).
- The final sentence of the manuscript is unclear. Presumably the authors recommend this for those diagnosed with Loa loa.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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