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Reviewer's report:

General
In this paper the Au. describe the epidemiological situation of CE in Slovenia, which according to provided data, seems to be improved.
The results are interesting but the Au. should clarify several points.

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

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

Au. should inform the reader on the origin of the all sera and not only those positive for CE (perhaps adding some marks on the map of Fig. 1).

No mention of the risk factors of individuals resulted serologically positive

Are criteria to consider low positivity indicated by the manufacturer?

The Au. mention other serological methods such as immunofluorescence, ELISA to confirm diagnosis but no data obtained with these methods is provided.

Only 48 out of 127 patients resulted positive at IHA were serologically confirmed, what was the IHA titre of those not confirmed (1:32??) and which hypotheses might be done to explain such high (>60%) level of false positivity?

The Au. state in the Results section that eight sera with patterns P4, and 6 sera with pattern P5 were not studied further. Were the patients really infected with E. multilocularis (according to clinical presentation?) or were their sera false positive for this species? If they were not false positive it should mean that around 21% of patients with confirmed echinococcosis are affected by AE. This point deserves more attention.

Results of confirmed cases might be summarised in a table where the percentages of different IHA titer and patterns of WB might be shown.

The Discussion section is too general and should be focused more on the obtained results.

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

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

Minor points:

Page 3, Line 8: Refs 1-5 are redundant and might be replaced by just a reference
related to one general review;
Line 9: ..having cystic echinococcosis..
Line 20: 1:128 or higher...
Page 4, Line 1: Liance et al. (in the text the year is missing)
Page 5, Line 17: delete ..or re-emergence..(incidence increase can already be considered a re-emergence)
last line: the reference to Fig. 1 here is not appropriate (better place in the results section)
Page 6, line 3: its and not it’s
Reference 10 is related to Central Europe and not to Italy and should be deleted in this point.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

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

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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