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PDF covering letter
I have fixed the outstanding problems:

1) The competing interests section has not been included in the paper. This should follow the conclusions. --Done

2) The authors names are written in full on the upload page but initialed in the manuscript. These need to match. --Done

3) Please clarify the affiliations. Each author needs to be linked to their corresponding affiliation by a superscript numeral. There are no countries in the affiliations. --Done

4) The abstract is longer than 250 words. This also needs to be changed on the upload page. --Done

5) The tables should follow the references. --Done

6) The running title and ‘AS SUBMITTED’ sentence should be removed. --Done

This is the covering letter that you did not get the last time:
Attention of Ruth King

Dear Editor,

Further to your email of 22nd of August we are delighted to submit a revision of our article.

We address the points made by the 2 new referees:

Prof. Peter Timms:

Point 1: We agree with this general comment. (no change required)

Point 2: A new paragraph has been added to the methods section which explains in detail the TCID50 estimation methodology.

Point 3: This is a good point, we have now acknowledged this as a self-criticism in the discussion and suggested it as a point to be borne in mind for future studies.

Point 4: We agree (no change required)

Dr Lisa Jackson

Point 1: Background: We have inserted a sentence to indicate that not all seroepidemiological studies have found positive associations.

Point 2: We do not really have any insight into this or anything useful to say. We used total white cells, which will include the mononuclear cells. (no change made)
Point 3: We agree that the macroscopic findings do not add much to the histological results. However it is still useful to briefly present this data so that this observation is apparent to others planning future studies. (no change made)

Point 4: We have changed the first sentence in the discussion accordingly.

Point 5: We have changed the last sentence accordingly.

I hope this is in order, thank you for your help,

-Conall McCaughey