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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Minor essential revisions
   Not enough re. data sources and their differences, thermal screening devices and their sensitivity/predictive values

3. Are the data sound?
   Major Compulsory Revision for data. Impossible to understand Table 1 which gives a range of numbers but no exact figures in columns 1,2,3 with no clear explanations. Several apparent mistakes for example in col.5 (the nb of dengue positive cases is 72 for 2007-9 whereas the true total seems to be 179 according to Text and Table 3; apparently this figure is only for year 2007 and does not include 2008-9 ; same comment for col.6). The reader is obliged to rebuild Table 1 in combination with Table 3 and text before being able to guess the results and their significance.

   Minor essential revisions recommended for Figures 1,2 : some editing needed; title of figure 1 is too long (does not need all details on the equations)

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   See methods (point 2)

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Major compulsory revision:
   - The discussion is fairly well presented but not fully supported by the data which is not understandable.
   - Wrong assertion about infectiousness period (e.g. "infectiousness starts a few days after the onset of symptoms");
   - No mention about the role of quarantine in secondary transmission although the title suggested that quarantine would be discussed.
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Difficult to say since data is difficult to understand

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
There are many similarities with a previous article (Int J Inf Diseases: "Epidemiological trends and the effect of airport fever screening on prevention of domestic dengue fever outbreaks in Taiwan, 1998–2007; Mei-Mei Kuan, Ting Lin, Jen-Hsiang Chuang and Ho-Sheng Wu").
A comment from the authors on how this new paper provides additional and/or innovative aspects to the previous one, would be appreciated.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
No. Title and abstract seemed to provide the additional aspects mentioned above (point 7), but the content of the paper is a bit disappointing in that regard.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Editing is needed

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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