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Reviewer’s report:

The paper reads much better in this more condensed form, focusing on molecular biology of cholera in Nepal.

I still have some minor comments:

1. Page 4, line 92: “although” seems to be displaced in the sentence?
2. Page 5, lines 119-122 were added from the previous version:
   a. The only country where cholera vaccine is used at large scale is Vietnam, other published experiences are focused on particular groups, outbreak response, pilot interventions or studies – scale up is clearly needed for public health impact of these vaccines - please add references if you have additional information
   b. I’m also not aware of efficacy of the vaccine being dependant on molecular characteristics of V. cholera – can you add a reference here? Or alternatively, you could skip the 2 sentences around the vaccines, as they not necessary for the topic of the article and rather confusing
3. Page 10, line 249: it is not clear how the 4 samples were randomly selected to represent the 3 districts? Random selection (how?) within each district?
4. Be consistent with abbreviations (or not) for the antibiotics – either they are abbreviated with their first time use and used as abbreviations thereafter, or alternatively don’t abbreviate and use full names throughout (lines 273, 325-7, etc)
5. Discussion, lines 300-305 – the first part of paragraph is an introduction to the topic, it is repetition
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