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Dear Editors and Reviewers,

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers’ comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Temporal Trend and Climate Factors of Hemorrhagic Fever with Renal Syndrome Epidemic in Shenyang City, China” (ID: 2903271448538366). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. Revised portion are marked in different colors in the paper, red for deletion, and blue for added content. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer’s comments are as follows:

Response to Editor’s comments:

1. whether the disease surveillance data used in your study was already anonymous when you obtained it and please state in your manuscript whether the data was publicly available and, if not, who provided the permission to use the data.

Response: The disease surveillance data used in this study was already anonymous. We state that the China CDC provides the permission to use the data. We have added it in “surveillance data” section.

2. We have corrected the format of our revised manuscript to conform to the journal style.

Response to comments of Referee:

1. Vaccination

I have read and absorbed some information from Bai’s paper and I have added this kind of information in the part of limitation. About the obvious decline of HFRS monthly incidence in 2007 compare to that in 2006, we also made a explanation in limitation part.

2. Study area

Thanks for your reminding. I have visited the official website of Shenyang government. I made a mistake. “10 districts” has been corrected to “9 districts”.

4. Regression model

We just compared the adjusted $R^2$ of these two models.

5. Figures

We have improved the resolution of these figures to meet the criteria for publication. In figure 4, it is monthly HFRS cases. We have improved the quality of Figure 4.
6. References

We have revised references to make them conform to the journal style. Thanks very much for your careful review.