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Reviewer's report:

Overall the manuscript has been greatly improved. The reading is much easier and smoother, and the methods has been clarified and are now easily understandable. The discussion and conclusions appear more meaningful, delivering their message in a more direct way.

I think the manuscript is good for publication. However some minor corrections should be done, to cope with some imprecisions in the description of what has been done.

1. Background

I suggest to re-check the following phrase, as the punctuation does not seem to be correct; moreover a full-stop is missing in the manuscript, at the end of the phrase.

"We recently reported the impact of treatment on the clinical course of influenza H5N1 and showed that though treatment with oseltamivir within 48 hours offers significant benefits in terms of survival, the benefits of treatment persist in terms of reduced case fatality rates, though to a lesser extent, even if treatment is delayed up to 6 to 8 days after symptom onset"

2. Methods: “Data on human avian influenza (H5N1) cases were collected between September 2005 – December 2010.”

I would suggest to change “between September 2005 – December 2010” either with “between September 2005 and December 2010”, or “from September 2005 to December 2010”

3. Methods: “Also, some cases were identified from a publication, and were also included in the registry”.

I would suggest to change the phrase with “The characteristics of some cases were acquired/obtained from literature, and added to the registry”. Moreover, if possible I would suggest to add how many cases were retrieved in this way.

4. Methods: “The case definition used included the World Health Organization case (WHO) definition and, in addition, laboratory confirmation from both Indonesia and WHO laboratories.”
This part is a bit unclear. I would suggest to simplify it. An option could be “Cases were defined accordingly to the World Health Organization (WHO) guidelines, and/or through laboratory confirmation from both Indonesia and WHO laboratories.”

5. Methods: “In this analysis we determined the following timelines for each case:”
As you are not describing the analysis you performed, I suggest to modify this part to something similar to “For each case the following timelines were determined:”

6. Results (Delays in Viral Testing and Initiation of Treatment):
“…and 43 cases who given antiviral treatment.”
Add “were” to “who given”. Even better, this could be change to “who received”.

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

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

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