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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear reviewers

Thank you as you reviewed and commented our manuscript carefully. Please see our replies to your comments as follow:

Editor comments

The authors have performed a systematic review about using secnidazole on bacterial vaginosis.

This review still needs bolstering.

Abstract - The rationale about why you have chose secnidazole for VB is not clear. Please rewrite the first sentence of the abstract with this. Thank you. The following sentence was added to the abstract:

The usual treatment for BV is metronidazole; hence 30% of women have recurrence within 60 to 90 days after treatment. There are some studies which assessed the effect of secnidazole on BV.

Introduction - Well-written. Thank you.
Methods - How did you correct heterogeneity? Random-effect model? Sensitivity analysis. This is not written. You had one forest plot with heterogeneity between 0-80%. You should modify the heterogeneity calculation.

Thank you for your comment. Actually we performed the random effect instead of fixed effect, but the heterogeneity did not decrease. Because only two studies were in the analysis, we were not able to use sensitivity analysis. We mentioned this matter in page 9.

Reference about the risk of bias should be added.

Thank you. This reference was added.

Another point is that you could add the GRADE system for analyzing the selected studies since you decided to include RCTs. Thank you. The GRADE table was created and added to the manuscript (Table 3).

Please, add why you did not perform publication bias.

Thank you. Because the number of studies was less than 10, therefore the assessment of publication bias was not necessary.

Results - I would transform supplementary material number 2 into Table 1. It is imperative that a systematic review presents a Table describing the main characteristics of the selected studies.

Thank you. Supplementary material 2 changed to “Table 2”.

Discussion - There is not a sentence containing the strengths of the review.

No suggestions regarding the profile for future studies are written and they should be written here as recommendations.

Thank you. A sentence about strength of this systematic review was added to the end of discussion.

The following statement was added to the conclusion: Secnidazole can be considered as an alternative to the treatment of BV for women who have experienced adverse effects or had a recurrence with current medications of BV.

Risk of bias figure - there is some blank spots on this figure that should be filled in.

Thank you. The blank points in the graph represent the unclear risk of bias. I added this explanations under the figure.
Reviewer reports:

Patricia Melli, Ph.D. (Reviewer 1): This journal citation on the "references" could not be validated on the linking service. Please the authors must verify if these datas are correct.

2,5,11,22

Thank you. I changed reference number 2. Reference number 5 has been published by Cochrane Databases and it was correct. Reference number 11 was revised and number 22 that now is number 23 checked and was correct. This article is in Chinese and only the abstract was in English.

Claudia Jacyntho, Ph.D. (Reviewer 2):

No restrictions for publication:

Clue cell better than key cell

AMSEL not AMSLE Thank you. They were corrected.