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Reviewer's report:

I'm recommending essential major revisions. The paper is a good report on the survey conducted in a district of Nepal. It would have been good to examine other areas where poultry farms are common. However, it can be published once these revisions are made.

1) I suggest that the paper be substantially reduced in length - it goes into far ranging discussions which are largely unrelated to the actual research. The bulk of the reduction should come form the introduction and discussion.

2) When did the study take place in terms of control activities? I did not get a sense of how much exposure these farms had had to any specific AI campaigns, what these campaigns achieved. Or did the study take place before a campaign?

3) Throughout the paper, the authors should include n/N where the N is the total number of respondents. It is hard to imaging that all participants completed all questions. If the response rate was > 90% to all questions, this should be stated. If it falls below this level to any question then the number of non-respondents should be noted.

4) You should include confidence intervals for the odds-ratios as well as the number included in the analysis.

5) In the discussion, page 15, the authors state that "only 4% actually notifying authorities..." is that because only 4% of the farms had been exposed? Were any of the included farms actually exposed to AI during any of the outbreaks?

6) The paper ends by saying that more resources should be available for Nepal over, say, Italy but does not mention how much money was spent in either country or actually what was done. Some information on this would be useful but is a largely redundant question because Italy is G20 nation and Nepal a low-income country. Comparisons are therefore spurious. What can be done in the low-income country setting? What works and what doesn't (i.e. what is cost-effective) That is the real message and the paper should be reviewed in this light.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
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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