Dear Editor,

I read the recent publication on ELISA for Diagnosis of Fasciolosis with great interest. Rahimi et al. concluded that “Cut-off values, sensitivity, specificity, and other important parameters of the two evaluated tests determined that the F-ELISA method could be used with no detectable difference.” Indeed, similarity in efficacy of the two studied methods might be derived. However, many factors determine the difference in practical usage. First, the cost effectiveness of each technique has to be assessed. Second, the technique that is easier to use, has fewer steps and clear reading of the results might be more acceptable by the users.
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Author’s Reply,

Thank you for your valuable comments. As you have attested, nowadays many factors affecting the validity of diagnostic tests should be taken into account when we attempt to establish a powerful diagnostic method. Currently, the cost of human and electrical power is increasing rapidly and many companies try continuously to provide a diagnostic test of high validity on the one hand while embracing all the criteria you have mentioned. Particularly in developing countries, where the cost of providing commercial kits is high, it is up to us as researchers to evaluate and introduce a test that is as economic as possible. As you have mentioned correctly, under the same circumstances, a test would be of more importance if it encompasses fewer steps, is cost effective with clear reading of the results and easy to handle. We hope our method can be effective in countries where fasciolosis is endemic or is an important issue.
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