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Author’s response to reviews:

Re: SYSR-D-17-00068

Dear Rakesh and Systematic Reviews Editorial Team,

Thank you for the opportunity to revise the manuscript “Cholera diagnosis in human stool and detection in water: protocol for a systematic review of available technologies”.

We wish to thank the two reviewers for the time devoted to this manuscript and their valuable comments. Please see replies agreed by the author team below.

Reviewer 2

Comment 1. the information about selection and inclusion criteria for articles is still repetitive, there's one paragraph considering individual criteria, then 2-3 paragraphs after you mention about geographic limitations in the search. Please revise this whole section and also suggest to
remove the sentence about the limitation of the search. you already mention this in the discussion.

Response: Thank you, we have revised the section, removed repetitions and refer readers to Figure 2 for more details on the inclusion/exclusion criteria employed.

Comment 2. Consider to revise your search terms, you should include mesh terms (pubmed) and equivalents in other databases, then consider using variation of term such as cholerae. Consider adapting your search based on the search strategies available in cochrane http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD008625.pub2/full.

Response: We refer the reviewer to Boxes 2 and 3:

- Mesh terms are included in searches and denoted as “MH”

- Variations of the search term have also been signalled by the inclusion of a truncation term (“*” – for example see Box 2, lines S6 and S7)

In reference to adapting strategies, we include strategies for Medline and CINAHL in the protocol and will further develop targeted equivalent strategies for Embase, Proquest, IndMed, Global Health Library, Scopus and the grey literature databases noted.

We thank the reviewer for their continued input!

Looking forward to hearing from you soon.

Best wishes,

Karin Diaconu