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General

-----------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

p9 and p11
To fulfil Kaplan criteria Table 2 shows that 85% had duration of illness 12-60hrs. Yet median duration of diarrhoea was 3 days (72hrs). This may well be due to susceptibility of those affected but this apparent contradiction is important and should be explained.

p9
Only 2 cases fell ill after their room mate but we do not know how many were sharing rooms nor how many became ill at same time as their room mate? And in the discussion p12 it is stated that attack rate was not higher among those who shared a room compared to those who did not, but I did not see any data to support this in results?

p9
Tables IV and V in text refer to Tables 3&4. These tables show results of those who became ill on Nov 2 and 3. This was not initially clear, and it would help to include results of those ill on the other days in the text (as this is referred to in the discussion).

-----------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

p5
The period to define selection of the cohort should be included here. (Persons from the A&AA and employees etc were presumably excluded because there were no cases among this group.)

p6
"case finding in the community" is slightly confusing as case definition excludes cases in the community. It could be "enquired about gastro-intestinal illness in the community"

-----------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
This is an interesting and well conducted study in difficult circumstances requiring relatively complex analysis. The paper may be easier to read with fewer subheadings.

**What next?:** Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No
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