

Dear Editor,

Thank you for the reviewer's comments on our article. We have revised the manuscript according to the recommendations. Please find our answers below. All changes in the manuscript are highlighted red.

Reviewer 1

1. Introduction section needs some information/basic knowledge of comparative techniques included molecular techniques.

More details on hantavirus diagnosis have been added (page 4, lines 7-13 and 15-19; page 5, lines 6-15).

2. There is lack of novelty as the similar studies already confirm the presence of hantavirus in patient samples. 3. What is new presented by author?

The aim of this study was to analyze the diagnostic value of IFA and WB method in the diagnosis of hantavirus infections (page 5, lines 17-19). Similar studies have confirmed the presence of hantaviruses, however there are very few data on the comparison of different serology methods used for hantavirus diagnosis. The presented results showed that WB is more specific than IFA and confirmed the serotype in majority of cross-reactive samples detected by IFA. These findings represent original contribution to better understanding of hantavirus diagnostic methods.

4. The results section needs the original images of results of western blot analysis.

Results of WB analysis have been added (figure 3).

5. There is lack of concern letter of patients included in the current work. This may be a cause of ethical issues.

The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Croatian Institute of Public Health. Informed consent was obtained from study participants (page 6, lines 11-13).

6. What was the rational to set two endpoint i.e. Death and severe respiratory complications.

The aim of this study was to analyze the diagnostic value of two serology methods and not the clinical endpoints.

7. The sample size may little increase. Also included some positive and negative control.

Unfortunately, the sample size can not be increased, however we thank the reviewer for this suggestion. We have explained the method in more detail.

8. More experiments are essential requirements of the current work which includes RT-PCR/Real time Florecent-ELISA.

The aim of this manuscript was to compare the diagnostic value of two serologic methods: IFA and WB. Therefore, RT-PCR was not performed.

9. Lack of current information in the present study.

In current literature there are very few data on the comparison of different serology methods used for hantavirus diagnosis. The presented results showed that WB is more specific than IFA and confirmed the serotype in majority of cross-reactive samples detected by IFA. These findings represent original contribution to better understanding of hantavirus diagnostic methods.

Minor comments

1. There are various grammatical and typo error throughout the MS.

Grammatical and typo errors have been corrected.

2. Conclusion also needs to revise with the light of results.

Conclusion has been corrected.

3. English should be revised in some parts of paper.

English has been revised.

We hope that the revised manuscript will be suitable for publication in *World Journal of Methodology*.

Best regards,

Tatjana Vilibic-Cavlek, MD, PhD, corresponding author

Reviewer 2

The study carried out in the current manuscript entitled Comparison of indirect immunofluorescence and western blot method in diagnosis of hantavirus infections can be accepted for the publication but need to check the typo error if any.

Thank you for the comments. Please find the revised version. Kind regards Anna Mrzljak