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In response to the letter to the editor presented in the journal “Considerations on the article -Evaluation of the level of knowledge about COVID-19 during the investigation of a doctor’s office”, I would like to thank the authors for their interest in the subject of the article, for the good analysis and for the points made, but I would like to respond from the humility and acceptance of some of your recommendations.

Regarding the fact that a glossary term does not appear for words that are difficult to understand, it is necessary to clarify that before delivering the questionnaires to the population, all the terms that could create doubts and misunderstanding on the part of the population were clarified and all the questions were answered. For that reason, it was not thought that the clarification of these terms was necessary.

Due to the topic about personal hygiene and the specific characteristics of hand washing, it should be clarified that during the talks and work sessions with the community, preventive measures and their specificities were addressed, although it was not expressed in a way of question in the questionnaire the subject was dealt with, and it is considered by the authors that if it had been included it would have been more enlightening. The authors agree that it would have been an enriching factor for the research to have specifically addressed the behavior of the acquisition of knowledge according to the age range.

Regarding the comment that there is no reference to the conditions of the place where the intervention was carried out and whether there was overcrowding or not and whether biosafety standards were met, it is necessary to clarify that in the design of the investigation at the diagnostic stage it is carried out and I quote verbatim “In order to make the diagnosis, the patients who made up the study sample were visited during the research with the biosafety norms required”.

However, it is mandatory to clarify that when it refers to the fact that the sample was divided into 10 groups, of approximately 40 members, it does not mean that the 40 members met in one place, as it would violate the biosafety standards and it was not possible due to the epidemiological situation that the town was going through at that time, but rather that 40 members were visited during the day in their respective places of residence during the screening to carry out the activities and without exposure to any danger. Your support for the perfection and quality of the article is appreciated and we confirm that the best way to do science is through criticism.
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