

Author's replies to reviewers' comments and details of corrections made in the manuscript

1. All the new minor corrections suggested by the reviewer Prof. Mohamed Refai (i.e., brucellosis and agglutination in small letters) have been included in the second revision of the manuscript.
2. As suggested by the reviewer SRJ, sensitivity and specificity of conventional RBPT and modified RBPT (Superagglutination) have been calculated, included and compared in the results. The test is being recommended as a screening test.
3. New data has been included in tables 1, 2 and 3.
4. Two new tables (Tables 4 and 5) containing new data on false positives and clump size have been added in the revised manuscript.
5. Two new references (Chachra et al, 2009 and Raes ul Islam et al, 2013) have been added in the discussion.
6. Reply to the comment by reviewer REJ:

The paper is intended to be the first report of a new diagnostic test giving better results than the conventional test. It deserves to be published immediately on account of novelty. Validation studies will take a long time and require additional resources, funding and manpower along with the involvement of multiple institutions. We intend to publish the validation data as a follow up paper after the completion of such studies. Repeatedly insisting on validation data in the first report itself is unfair. Delay in publication of the first results may give unfair advantage to other researchers who are aware of this idea or who had an access to the manuscript before publication. Those having better resources and more manpower may even publish their work based on our idea even before the original innovators.

It is requested that in the interest of fair play and to protect the confidentiality of the innovation the revised manuscript may be published immediately without any further delay