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**Reviewer's report:**

General comments: The revised version of the paper entitled as “The first clinical case due to AP92 like strain of Crimean-Congo hemorrhagic fever virus and a field survey” is reviewed. This reviewer pointed out that the attack rate of CCHF virus strain KMAG cannot be calculated in the previous review. Although the authors replied that the attack rate was given for overall CCHF infection, not specific for CCHFV KMAG in the replies to my review, it is still written as “The attack rate, that was defined as the proportion of diseased subjects among the infected ones was two out of 38 (5.2%) (Page 8, lines 14-15)”. The authors should clearly mention that the attack rate was given for overall CCHF virus infection, not specific for CCHFV KMAG in this sentence. Without this clarification, it makes the readers misunderstand the context. The authors described that the attack rate was very low compared to the CCHF strains” (Page 8, lines 15-16). It is written that the attack rate was compared to the CCHF strains. Clarify what were the CCHF (virus?) strains, which were the target compared to by the attack rate. Based on the descriptions, this reviewer considers that the authors compared the attack rate of CCHFV KMAG with those of the other strains such as CCHFV isolated in Russia. In the entire text, the terms “CCHF strains”, “CCHF viral strains”, “CCHF virus”, “CCHFV”, etc, appear. Unify the terms throughout the entire text according to the meaning of each term.

**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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