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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors,

I am writing to resubmit our manuscript, titled “Integrating an infectious disease programme into the Primary Health Care service: A retrospective analysis on Chagas disease community-based surveillance in Honduras”

We thoroughly revised the manuscript based on the reviewer’s comments and reflected them on the current version.

The details are found in the section below.

Sincerely,
Ken Hashimoto

Reviewer: It reads more like an internal report than like a scientific paper. It is quite long and contains quite some lyrics. It should be more focused and condensed.

Hashimoto: The whole manuscript was rewritten as a scientific paper, shorted by more than 1,000 words, and restructured to focus on the principal objective.

Reviewer: What is the objective of this paper? Do you want to make a process analysis? Do you want to prove the feasibility of primary-care based control? Do you want to show the effects? Do you want to show the efficiency? This is not clear to me.

Hashimoto: In the final paragraph of Introduction, we clearly stated the objective: analysis on the operational process taken to integrate the Chagas disease surveillance system into the PHC service in Honduras during 2008-2010, to identify key factors and draw lessons.
Reviewer: The entire field of costs would be of high importance. You hardly mention this.

Hashimoto: We included in our analysis an annual health care cost for a Chagas disease chronic patient, as part of social burden. Also, in Discussion, we created a section “Cost management” and discussed about reduced financial costs and increased opportunity costs.

Reviewer: The precede-proceed model is the core, but you hardly describe it. It is a framework model for practical management? Is it an evaluation instrument? Is it commonly used? Where does it come from? Who developed it? Why this model and not other management frameworks?

Hashimoto: We rewrote the exoplanetary paragraph in such a way to explain “what and why” of employing the PRECEDE-PROCEED model.

The integration process of the surveillance system was analysed retrospectively using the PRECEDE-PROCEED (predisposing, reinforcing, and enabling constructs in educational/ecological diagnosis and evaluation – policy, regulatory, and organisational constructs in educational and environmental development) model for health programme planning [15]. The PRECEDE-PROCEED is a framework designed to investigate health related-behaviours and environment of a particular issue from; epidemiological, social behavioural, educational, administrative and political perspectives, consequently to plan public health interventions based on the analysis (Figure 1). Retrospective study of the integration process using the model was considered to facilitate multidisciplinary and systematic analysis to determine key interactive factors from the community to the policy level.

Reviewer: You do not really describe how you got your data and information.

Hashimoto: In the Figure 1, we added a table below describing the corresponding indicators, data collection methods and principal instruments.

Reviewer: Consequently the paper lacks evidence for quite some statements.

Hashimoto: In the revised manuscript, our discussions are based on the evidential indicators, actions, documents and policies.

Reviewer: Introduction: it is not clear when you talk about Honduras, Latin America or the world.

Hashimoto: In each paragraph, we now clearly state the geographic scale of the description.

Reviewer: The main body of the text could benefit by separating your own findings and the state-of-the-art from the literature. You mix this up
Hashimoto: We rewrote the whole manuscript, shifting our focus from “the state-of-the-art” statements to the implications of findings (key factors and lessons).

Reviewer: Minor issues:
- Quality of figures should be improved
- English should be corrected
- Do you really mean "Ministry of Health in Latin America"?

Hashimoto: We detailed Figure 1 to show the entire PRECEDE-PROCEED model and created Figure 2 with focus onto the process of integration. English was revised and corrected. We eliminated the sentence included "Ministry of Health in Latin America".