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Author's response to reviews: see over
Cover Letter for the revised Manuscript (second Reviewers revision)

First Reviewer's report
Title: Prevalence of Trichomonas Vaginalis Infection in Egyptian Women: Cross-Sectional Study
Version: 5
Date: 25 August 2014
Reviewer: Asghar Fazaeli
Reviewer's report:
1- English writing still need improving. revised
2- The parasite species name should be corrected to standard writing as “T.vaginalis“ corrected all through the manuscript
3- The reference number of the agreement issued by the local organization Ethical Committee must be referred to in the manuscript.: the specification of the month and year of approval from dept council as well as from the faculty were added (line 90-92) (no reference number in our system)
4- The reference list should be modified according to the format defined by the Journal guideline. All references were revised and modified
5- The authors were recommended, in the first reviewing, to include the other STI or vaginitis agents detected in the study patients, particularly the T. v positive cases. However, they are not yet mentioned in the manuscript. It is mentioned in the conclusion and recommendation section (line 224, 225) (done in the previous revision, as per your recommendations)
6- There is no caption for the Figure to address different panels; neither the panels are labeled to be addressed in the Fig description. Figure label added in the text (line 113, 116 and 126)

Level of interest:
An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English:
Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
Statistical review:
Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests.

Second Reviewer's report
Title:
Prevalence of Trichomonas Vaginalis Infection in Egyptian Women: Cross-Sectional Study
Version: 5
Date: 28 August 2014
Reviewer: Barbara Body
Reviewer's report:
Major compulsory revisions:
1) Although the authors addressed why they chose not to look at other causes of vaginitis in their cover letter, they didn’t include this information in the manuscript. A simple statement such as, “We have previously studied other causes of vaginitis in our center and limited this study to a large scale cross-sectional study to assess the incidence of Trichomonas.” would be sufficient. Statement added at the beginning of the discussion (line 156, 157)
2) The manuscript needs to clarify exactly what number of specimens were uniquely positive by culture, Giemsa, wet prep and Kalon. If Kalon detected all 50 positives — those positive by culture, Giemsa and Wet prep, that would be remarkable. As shown by table 1 (which was added in the previous revision): Culture detected 30 true positive, Kalon detected 50 positive (but 20 of them were false positive), Wet mount detected 10 positives
3) I don’t find credible the high percentage of specimens positive uniquely by Geimsa and wet prep (& possibly Kalon), respectively compared to culture. This is not comparable to data in the literature which would typically show wet prep orGeimsa to detect about 50% of those specimens positive by culture. This unusual performance needs explanation. Wet mount and Giemsa detected ONLY 10 positive cases, Kalon detected 30 positive cases out of the whole 50 positive cases (as the other 20 positive cases detected by Kalon were false positive when compared to Culture), and this is comparable to Literature (Table 1)
4) The focus of this manuscript and therefore the conclusions and recommendations should be statements pertaining to the testing of women for Trichomonas vaginalis. It is not appropriate for the conclusion & recommendation section to make conclusions about the reliability of the Kalon latex agglutination test reliability. This manuscript has not presented data that demonstrates by discrepant analysis that the results of the Kalon test were correct. The conclusion and recommendations focused on Latex agglutination, coming from its availability, easiness, relatively cheap (in our community), and not time consuming, in order to consider adding it as a screening test in the gynecology clinics in Egypt (at least university hospitals) (as done with Pap smear for cancer cervix...) as it will help in rapid and more or less accurate screening, and start treatment for cases suspected to have T.vaginalis infection.
5) Photos are unlabelled and without narrative duplicate photos are still present and need to be removed for the Giemsa stain and wet prep. For the Wet Prep photo, I would use only the small photo on the upper left. Label to the photos added

Minor essential revisions
There are still numerous typographical errors including misspelling of Trichomonas in the title of the manuscript that need to be addressed. Spelling checked all over the manuscript, including the title

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
**Declaration of competing interests:** I have participated in clinical trials for the FDA clearance of nucleic acid amplification tests from two manufacturers. I did not receive compensation but the company for which I work was paid to perform the testing. I do not have any other financial or non-financial competing interests