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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.

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.

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 or Geimsa to detect about 50% of those specimens positive by culture. This unusual performance needs explanation.

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.

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.

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

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.
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