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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear editor,

Thank you for your comments and suggestions. Herewith we are sending you the revised version of our article ‘Incidence, risk factors and treatment of diarrhoea among Dutch travellers: reasons not to routinely prescribe antibiotics’.

Our answers to the comments and suggestions of the reviewers:

Reviewer: 1

This is a clearcut paper which is well written and deserves to be published. A few questions and comments are listed below:

1. How did the investigator knew that all participants were immunocompetent? 
   The travellers at our travel clinic fill out a questionnaire about their health, including a question if they have an immune disorder. We excluded those who reported an immune disorder.

2. It is somewhat sad that the traditional definition of TD was not used. It would have been possible to ask for the number of stool passages and thereby achieving additional information. As it is now, the authors rightly admit difficulties to compare with other studies and the attack rate in the present study was high......
   As the participants did see a registered nurse at the return (good!), it would have been possible to include further questions on compliance to sanitary recommendation, albeit in retrospect
   We are aware of this omission, but unfortunately did not collect these data.

3. Was it possible to learn if the users of an antibiotic had started with loperamide? 
   Yes, of the 36 18 had also started with an antimotility agent. There was no relation to the severity of diarrhoea. We have now added this in the result section.

Reviewer: 2

Minor Revisions

1. The percentages in Table 1 should be checked
   We have adjusted the lay-out of the table clarifying the presentation. We corrected the legend as well, because we changed the text by mistake.

2. In Tables 2 and 3 should be expressed if the rate ratios are crude or adjusted
   We have now added to the tables that the rate ratios were crude.

3. The authors should comment how many of the travellers were previously cholera vaccinated and how many, between vaccinated and unvaccinated, had diarrhoea during the trip. If the vaccine is not licensed in the country where the study was made, this point should be clarified.
The cholera vaccine is licensed in our country, but it is not indicated according to the Dutch guidelines.

We would like to thank you for your comments.

Yours Sincerely,

S. Belderok, MD.
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