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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.

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.

All other comments have been dealt with satisfactorily.
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