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Reviewer's report:

The Manuscript has been improved significantly. This work is acceptable upon minor revision.

1 – Professional English revision is still required. There are a number of mistakes throughout the manuscript, such as sentences lacking subject (“…thus increases the chances…”), sentences and predicates separated by commas (“…the reduction of host defenses in these hospitalized patients, has favoured…”), wrong verbal agreement (“…clinical samples (nasopharyngeal swab) was collected…”; “…all these patients had were admitted…”), wrong spelling (“neuroaminidase”; “Haematoly”), non-sense phrases (“…also if only few cases were reported…”), wrong use of prepositions (“… respiratory status died for fatal influenza…”), use of contract forms (“…the outbreak disease spread: it wasn’t possible…”). Notice that these are just examples, major English revision is necessary in the manuscript.

2 - Although the most used abbreviation for the 2009 pandemic Influenza A/H1N1 virus is H1N1pdm09, the authors have chosen to abbreviate it as H1N1dpm09. Please, correct it throughout the manuscript.

3 – Authors mentioned in the Results section, third paragraph from the bottom, that 13.1% with respect to H275Y mutation. Is that the frequency of mutant quasi-species in the viral population? I am confused, because it is mentioned that only in patient 4 mixtures of mutant and WT virus was detected. Please clarify.

4 – In the discussion section, when the authors list the factors that could account for nosocomial transmission, geographic proximity of the patients is mentioned. Please clarify or remove it, because this would mean that virus could have been acquired outside the hospital environment, un-characterizing nosocomial transmission.

5 – I would recommend to the authors to mention in their point-by-point responses where the changes were made in manuscript text and to mark it in the manuscript. This improves the reviewers analysis and speed up the manuscript processing.
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