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Dear Dr. Alam,

We greatly appreciate and have addressed Dr. Chan’s comments to better clarify samples selected for viral culture. In addition, references were reformatted according to the guidelines given on the Biomed Central Website. Please see below for a point-by-point description of the modification made to the manuscript. Please consider the revised manuscript “Influenza virus infection among pediatric patients reporting diarrhea and influenza-like illness ” for publication as a research article.

If additional information is required. Please contact the corresponding author.

respectfully submitted,

Matthew R. Kasper, PhD
U.S. Embassy Jakarta
UNIT 8132 NAMRU2
FPO AP 96520
+62 21 421 4457 (Office)
+62 21 428 73658 (fax)
kasper@namrutwo.org
kaspersnamru2@yahoo.com
Reviewer's report

Title: Influenza virus infection among pediatric patients reporting diarrhea and influenza-like illness

Version: 2 Date: 2 November 2009

Reviewer: Martin C. W. Chan

Reviewer's report:

Minor essential revisions
1. The selection scheme the authors used and the number of specimens they sent for MDCK culture remain unclear. For instance, in “Methods”->”Laboratory testing” section, the authors wrote “Based on RT-PCR results, clinical specimens that were positive were sent for viral isolation; a random sample of negative specimens was sent for viral culture as well.” I interpret that the authors sent all the flu viral RNA positive respiratory (n=85) and fecal (n=21) specimens for culture. In “Results” section, however, the authors said only 13 positive stool specimens were tested, and the number of positive respiratory specimens tested was not shown. The authors should state that a subset of positive specimens were randomly selected and should specify the exact number of specimens of each type tested.

   RESPONSE: We have edited the methods and results section to explain the selection scheme of samples sent for MDCK culture. In addition, in the results section we include how many of each sample (positive or negative) was selected for viral culture.

   In the “Methods” -> “Laboratory Testing” section, the description of samples sent for viral culture was re-written to state “Based on RT-PCR results, a random sample of positive clinical specimens was selected for viral isolation; a random sample of negative specimens was sent for viral culture as well.”

   In the “Results” section, the number of positive and negative respiratory specimens tested was included. Specifically, the manuscript now states “…a subset of randomly selected PCR positive and PCR negative samples (18 and 38, respectively) were submitted for viral culture…”

2. “References” section still need polishing. For example, journal New England Journal of Medicine was shown in two different styles in refs. 26 and 27.

   RESPONSE: The references were reformatted according to the guidelines given on the Biomed Central Website.
All other comments have been dealt with satisfactorily.
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