

September 24, 2015

To: Fang-Fang Ji, Editor, *World Journal of Immunology*

Re: Response to reviews of 21282

Dear Dr. Ji,

We would like to thank the reviewers for their thorough review of our manuscript entitled "Syphilis Testing Algorithms: A Review". We feel that the comments were appropriate and have addressed them, point-by-point below and in our revised manuscript.

Sincerely,

Elitza S. Theel, PhD, D(ABMM)

#### **Response to Reviewer #1**

Major Comment 1 – "...in the introduction, the authors promise that 'this discussion will also explore the challenges presented by the ethical environment surrounding syphilis testing'...which is in my view not fulfilled."

We agree with the reviewer that a discussion of the ethical issues regarding syphilis testing were not included in the original manuscript. Therefore, the comment regarding discussion of ethics was removed from the manuscript.

Major Comment 2 – "...the economical aspects are not presented in a detailed way..."

The reviewer is correct. As there is such a difference in assays and methodologies used for syphilis testing, it was felt that providing precise cost values for just one or two of the assays would not be helpful for the readership. Rather we included general statements to indicate that manual assays are typically less expensive compared to ELISAs. Though we agree with the reviewer regarding the importance of determine assay cost, a careful cost analysis of these three algorithms and the various assays used is beyond the scope of this review.

#### **Response to Reviewer #2**

This reviewer did not have any concerns or comments regarding the manuscript.

**Journal Review.**

We have added titles to both Figure 1 and Table 1 as requested.