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Reviewer's report:

Overall this paper has improved but is still in need of major revision. I strongly advise the use of a professional editor or native English speaker to correct the numerous grammatical errors, as the meaning of the paper is sometimes difficult to understand.

Major revisions:

1. Please describe in more detail the alerts from pathology, pharmacy, and radiology. Were there automated triggers to send an alert? If it was not automated, did the investigators rely on a defined set of criteria, or a loose definition that was consistent with mold infection? This information will be very useful for anyone who tries to replicate this type of surveillance.

2. A better definition of possible nosocomially-acquired infection would be a case that has onset >7 days after admission, WITHOUT a preceding negative respiratory culture. Apologies if this was not clear in the previous review.

3. Pg 5, line 25. As discussed previously, it is only valid to perform calculations for nosocomial IA incidence- please specify that these are the calculations being performed here.

4. Pg 7, line 23. How were air samples taken? Please place this in the methods section.

5. Figures 1 and 2. Again, incidence calculations should only be for nosocomial IA. Please delete overall IA incidence from these figures. The authors can consider combining 1 and 2 for brevity.

6. Pg 8, lines 9-16. This continues to confuse me. 39 patients had a transplant; 33 were late onset and 11 were early onset (=44 transplants). Please clarify.

7. Pg 9, line 18. Please provide evidence/data that pharmacological reports did not add to IA detection.

8. Pg 11, line 1-3. These seem like new data. Please present supporting results in the results section.

9. Pg. 11, lines 10-11. These are pertinent results and should be in the results section. Please include total admissions, # of alerts (by each method), and # of cases resulting (by each method).

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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