Reviewer’s report

Title: Protective practices against zoonotic infections among rural and slum communities from South Central Chile

Version: 2
Date: 19 May 2015
Reviewer: Marguerite Pappaioanou

Reviewer’s report:

The authors of this manuscript responded very insightfully and carefully to every question, comment, and suggestion I raised in the original review. The manuscript reads very well now, and is very clear in its purpose, objectives, methods, results and discussion. I congratulate the authors on their careful review and revision of the manuscript.

- Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which the author can choose to ignore)

  • It would really be great if there were actionable items that the authors feel are warranted by the findings of this study. Right now, the main recommendation going forward is to obtain additional/complementary information from additional research, which is very important. But I wondered if there was any take home message on whether the data/findings they present could be used for prevention practices that might be undertaken by the participating communities?

- Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

  • Abstract, Conclusions, third sentence: I believe the authors meant “The wide differences…. ” rather than “wide communities….”. Perhaps they meant the sentence to read as follows: “The wide differences in the proportion of households participating in protective practices against human exposure to zoonotic pathogens between? Across? communities, suggests that…. .”

  • Background—last paragraph, second to last sentence—I believe the authors meant “within and across 3 distinct community types”, not “within and across a distinct community type”

  • Discussion—last paragraph, second sentence: The authors used the phrase “varied heavily” which is a bit unusual, and perhaps instead of “heavily” one of the following words would be a better, less awkward choice: greatly, widely, significantly.

- Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

  • Background of main article, first sentence— The reference cited for the first
sentence actually states that 868 (61%) of 1415 species of infectious organisms known to be pathogenic to humans, are zoonotic, and 175 species are considered emerging. and of the 175 emerging pathogen species, 132 (75%) are zoonotic. Also, since zoonotic pathogens are not the same as diseases necessarily, the sentence should be revised to one of the following options (or close to them): 1) Zoonotic pathogens, which are those transmitted between humans and animals, are estimated to account for 61% of infectious organisms known to be pathogenic to humans; OR 2) Of emerging infectious pathogens, 75% are estimated to be zoonotic—those transmitted between humans and animals.