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Reviewer’s report:

General

The authors have responded adequately to Reviewer 3’s comments; however, they have not incorporated these responses into the revised manuscript, in particular into the methods section. Their responses need to be incorporated briefly so that future readers can also benefit from their explanations.

This is particularly true for responses to 1 and 3; I would also appreciate short explicit statements re responses 2, 4 and 6 in the text.

I agree with the authors that the use of case fatality rate for CFR is not “entirely accurate scientifically”. Just because terms are used commonly, even in “daily life”, does not mean that the scientific literature should be incorrect.

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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