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|  | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s Feedback*(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimumof 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | This manuscript on the age-dependent prevalence of *Loa loa*amicrofilaremia and microfilaremia provides valuable insights into how parasitological and immunological markers vary with age in endemic regions. It highlights the significant role age plays in defining infection status, thereby helping researchers understand disease dynamics and potential genetic or immunological factors influencing the infection. By employing advanced diagnostic markers like specific IgG4, this study paves the way for improved strategies in disease control and understanding population-level responses to *Loa loa* infection. This research is crucial for developing targeted approaches to manage and mitigate the disease in affected communities. |  |
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| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The abstract is clear and provides important information about the study. |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.** | The manuscript appears scientifically correct and is based on sound methodology, statistical analysis, and the use of well-established diagnostic markers. However, here are some observations to ensure scientific rigor and comprehensiveness:1. While the methods are well-described, the manuscript could benefit from more details on the limitations of the ELISA technique used for IgG4 detection and its sensitivity in endemic populations.
2. Potential genetic studies suggested by the results could be expanded with references to similar studies in other parasitic infections.
3. Include a brief explanation of why the prevalence of microfilaria carriers declines after age 65 despite previous infection.
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| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The language and English quality of the article are generally clear and suitable for conveying scientific information. However, there are areas where improvements can enhance clarity:1. Some sentences are lengthy and could be simplified for better readability.

Example: "Loiasis infection is characterised by long term stability in infection status" could be rewritten as "Loiasis infection is marked by long-term stability in infection status."1. Avoid redundancy. For instance, "These observations show the importance of age for the definition of the amicrofilaremic or microfilaremic individual status" could be condensed to "These findings highlight the role of age in defining amicrofilaremic or microfilaremic status."
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