The present study describes the clinical differences between circulating influenza strains in a young adult population issue from military camps in Singapore on May 2009 (before community spread of A/H1N1 2009).

The sound of this study is interesting because few articles documented the clinical differences between pandemic and seasonal A and B influenza strains in young adults. However, the authors described results precedently published by Lee et al., in PlosOne and the different sections of the manuscript are very similar to that of this cited manuscript. The authors have to considerly improved and rewriting each section of the article.

Title
1) The title is adequate

Abstract
2) The abstract is not informative: Enrollemnt of patients is not clearly described and statistical analysis are not cited

Results precedently published have to been deleted and original results highlighted

Background section
The background section has to be improved to explain what are the epidemiological investigations previously performed, to better introducing and justify the aim of the study. Moreover, this section is very similar to that reported by Lee et al (PlosOne 2011).

Methods
1. Enrollement criteria have to be better explained: Why the authors choice the FRI definition? Which advantage with respect to ILI case definition? The authours have to better explained the inclusion criteria and the clinical informations collected for each patient

2. Laboratory Methods The mean time delay between the respiratory sampling and the virological analysis remains to be precised into the method section. Moreover the details of this section have been yet reported by Lee.

3. Sequencing: The authors have sequenced samples, but what sequencing brings to the article (a part of that the circulating strains are A/California/7/2009(H1N1)-likevirus, A/Perth/16/2009-(H3N2)-like virus, and
influenza B from the Victoria-lineage, closely related to the B/Brisbane/60/2008-like virus)?

Results section

1. First paragraph requires classification: 2858 are 98% of what?
2. 881 patients are positives to influenza but only 771 are listed
3. A table showing the main clinical demographical characteristics of patients which respect to the viral strains isolated could be useful
4. Results described are confusing, please reported in the text only principal results described in the tables and in the figures
5. Fever >37.5 C with cough and/or sore throat are criteria that normally are founded in all patients, why the authors compared patients with respect to these characteristics?

Discussion section

The authors have to discuss their results and they have to better explain clinical differences between influenza strains analysed

Differences in the clinical symptoms of influenza strains analysed could have been influenced by vaccination, antiviral therapy, comorbidity and the health status of the patients included. This point could be explained in the second paragraph of the discussion.

The third paragraph is not clear, and it could be improved with recent studies that attended to describe clinical differences among respiratory viruses
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