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Reviewer’s report:

This revised manuscript provides more informative detail and is improved in a way to make it more understandable to the reader. Though there could be further streamlining of the text and tables to make the article easier for the reader to follow, the manuscript is acceptable and a helpful contribution to the field.

Major compulsory revisions:

1. Results: Page 10 and Table 1 – Either the table or the text needs to identify how much missing or incorrect data resulted in excluded reports. The reader needs to understand whether the number is minimal enough such that their exclusion would not have influenced the findings.

Minor essential revisions:

2. Background: page 4 – Are outbreaks assumed to have ended after the symptom onset or date of infection of the last case?

3. Background: page 5 – Missing word in the sentence starting “Public health authorities can raise alertness of patients and physicians with regards **to** certain diseases ….”

4. Background: Page 6 – Citations at end of Background (moved from Discussion) should be moved to earlier in the Background section as part of supportive background information.

5. Methods: Page 7 – The newly inserted sentence in the 1st paragraph should clarify that the authors are referring to the criteria used by providers or laboratories to report these disease cases.

6. Discussion: Page 13, end of 2nd paragraph – The addition of the phrase “finding order to identify reasons” to the last sentence makes the sentence unclear in its meaning.

7. Table 1: Though the addition of the total N in the table is informative, the table is now more cluttered. All of the data points are not easy to interpret because the explanation of the data in parentheses is described in the footnotes, whereas the two other data points displayed in Column 2 are described in the column heading. Please try to make the table clearer to read without having the reader jump around to find explanatory information.
Discretionary revisions:
None
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