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Reviewer’s report:

General

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

The authors have answered most of my comments on the manuscript successfully. A few minor issues however are still of concern.

The number of animals still appear to be a problem. The authors indicated the correct number is 77, but on page 5 – line 3 – 76 is still indicated.

When estimating prevalence of infection (exposure) the period when colostral antibodies would normally be detected should be excluded as this is not true prevalence.

My previous comment that ELISA test does not detect infection still stands. This is not adequately dealt with in the text.

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

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

The manuscript seems a bit long.

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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