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**Reviewer's report:**

The paper entitled Strengthening community-based tools for dengue prevention: a crosssectional survey in the temperate region (Madeira, Portugal) is a relevant research that addresses a topic of interest to control the dengue. The theme provides an important contribution to the field of vector-borne infectious diseases in regions whose geography - an island - is the differential of this study.

With respect to writing, sometimes there is a difficult understanding English, and I suggest that we make a review of the content of the article in this aspect. Suggest some alterations to make the article more clear and understandable.

The introduction addresses the problem of dengue in Madeira in Portugal, in a clear and objective adopting a theoretical citing several studies in the area that support the theoretical results. However, the quote of epidemiological data in the world (WHO 2009) I suggest that authors can use a more current reference.

Regarding the method I consider the need for some clarification, it is important for authors to revise the description of his work in this section:

- the design of cross-sectional study is cited in the title and abstract, but in the article, this design is not mentioned, so I suggest is cited in the article body cross-sectional study;
- Suggest include the characterization of geography - variations in temperature and rainfall - in the study area;
- the calculation of the sample there is no information of the island's total population - suggest a better detailing of the island's population; review the data presented regarding the study sample - there are different values - in short (1276/1183), the method (1082 + 20%) and results (1276/1182). The investigation and application of the interviews are well described.

The results are consistent, well presented, which were addressed aspects of the proposed method. There are some issues that are reviewed by the authors suggest:

a) in Table 1 number of participants by gender does not match the value of the sample and interviewed at the end of the research: it is well to an analysis performed - (n = 1276 - 761 female / male 506);

References - the authors cite Article Santos et al, 2011 - reviewing the article
title.

The authors discuss the results with the literature and an adequate theoretical

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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