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Dear Dr. Roselle Pangilinan,

Thank you very much for your letter and advice. We have revised the paper, and would like to re-submit it for your consideration. We have addressed the comments raised by the reviewers, and the amendments are highlighted in red in the revised manuscript. We also have correctly formatted our revised manuscript according to the journal style. We hope that the revision is acceptable, and I look forward to hearing from you soon.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Jia-Bin Li

Department of Infectious Diseases,
the First Affiliated Hospital of Anhui Medical University,
Hefei, Anhui 230022, the People’s Republic of China.

We would like to express our sincere thanks to the reviewers for the constructive and positive comments.

Replies to Professor Heuberger

Needs some language corrections before being published

The revised manuscript has been edited by a medical editing company in Hong Kong.

Replies to Professor Mignon du Plessis

1. Formatting and written English is still extremely poor - the authors need to standardise font type, font size and spacing. They also need to learn how to insert line numbers. I hope they know how to use and accept the 'track changes' function in Microsoft Word - please check with them.
Think you very much for your finding. We indeed neglect the mistakes in our draft. Especially, a mixture of different fonts were used in the tables and figure. We have adjusted the fonts of the tables and figure according to the journal.

Actually, we used to highlight amendments in red in our revised manuscript and neglect the 'track changes' function in Microsoft Word, this time, we learned to use 'track changes' to amend our manuscript and find it very useful.

2. The stats and interpretation of the stats possibly need checking by a statistician - this is not my area of expertise.

Think you for your advice and the materials and informations about stats in our manuscript have been checked again by a statistician.

3. The flow is problematic in places and the authors repeat themselves on occasion - each paragraph needs to be linked to a single idea/theme. The Results section is especially problematic and difficult to follow.

In our revised manuscript, we have deleted some repeated and unimportant sentences.

4. Some tables and figures are incorrectly referred to - please double check that each table/figure is correctly mentioned in the text.

Correction has been made in the revised manuscript.

5. With regard to the authors' response to my previous comments - some of these have not been incorporated into the text i.e. authors have tried to explain in the rebuttal letter but have not included the information in the manuscript.

Think you for your comment. Actually, the reason that previous comments had not
been incorporated into the text is because some previous questions have no connection with our text, we explained in our cover letter. For example, the question 2 was “Page 3 - Methods - please indicate which area was sampled - only Hefei City? How many hospitals/clinics and during which years.” we answered in our cover letter “All of the cases were sampled only in Hefei City. There are about 40 hospitals/clinics and only six hospitals have departments of infectious disease. Patients with meningococcal Disease were only admitted in one of above six hospitals.”.