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**Reviewer's report:**

The article entitled “Clinical, epidemiological, and spatial characteristics of Vibrio parahaemolyticus diarrhea and cholera in the urban slums of Kolkata, India” is considering the differences in clinical, epidemiological and spatial characteristics of the two Vibrio species in the urban slums of Kolkata, India. This paper describes the differences in clinical, epidemiological and spatial characteristics of diarrhea due to V. cholerae and V. parahaemolyticus from non-coastal areas. The subject is very interested as there are not a lot of articles involved with Vibrio in non coastal areas.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   The question posed by the authors is well defined.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   The methods are appropriate and well described by the authors.

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes the data is adequate. The figure 1 should be replaced by a figure showing the monthly presence of cases but in each year.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   The article satisfy the standards for reporting and data deposition.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   The discussion is well balanced and supported by the data presented.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes the limitations are clearly stated. Especially the drop-off the study are presented.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   Yes. The title is accurate.
9. Is the writing acceptable?
The writing is acceptable and the English is good

Discretionary Revisions (which are recommendations for improvement but which
the author can choose to ignore).

None

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of
a term, which the author can be trusted to correct).
The figure 2 is not clear. It should be presented in a monthly base but for all
years analytically

Major Compulsory Revisions (which the author must respond to before a
decision on publication can be reached)
None

**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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