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Dear Editor and peer-reviewers,

Many thanks for your very constructive comments that helped us improve the quality of our manuscript (MS: 7864890021116449).

Enclosed is a point-by-point response to the reviewers’ comments, which we hope to have addressed in full.

Referee 1

1-Though not of major importance based on the approach used by the authors, it would be curious to know the actual kill effect (using bioassays) or bioavailability of the insecticide (using HPLC) of the nets after the 18 month follow up. Such data would guide policy as to whether it is relevant to encourage repair of the nets where possible or simply replace them and would also strengthen the scope of the manuscript.

Response: We agree that it would be curious to know the actual bio-efficacy of the nets that was not included in our study and represented a potential limitation. However, we previously reported the tendency of bio-efficacy of the nets that decreased from 9-58% after 6 months (reference 11). This limitation has been clarified in discussion section page 12, lines 6-9.

Referee 2

1-The type of net (manufacturer, trademark) evaluated is not mentioned, but it should be. This is essential programmatic information - not all nets behave similarly. The authors simply note that they were all polyethylene and light blue.

Response: This point has been addressed. The manufacturer and trademark of the net have been mentioned in methods section, page 3 lines1-2.

2-No measure of actual entomological impact (some form of bioassay) is included in their investigation. This would have been a welcome addition, but the absence of that data does not detract from their central aim of assessing survivorship based on existing RBM recommendations and NetCALC expectations.

Response: This question has been addressed in the response to referee 1 (please see above).

We hope that we have taken into account the recommendations that were very useful and improved the quality of the manuscript.

Many thanks