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Reviewer's report:
This is a well-written study utilizing a comprehensive data set that allows for interesting conclusions. I only have a few minor comments.

* I would consider changing the word "contacts" throughout. (Perhaps "visits"?) In epidemiological terms, contacts usually refers to individuals to whom disease may be transmitted. Reading the manuscript, I kept having to force myself to adjust to contacts as communication with and/or visit to a health care provider, as opposed to contacts in an STD investigation sense.

* One of the things I found missing from the manuscript is an enumeration of what characteristics correlate with a positive Lyme test. I think it is important to include such, as both the implications and conclusions sections refer to creation of an algorithm tailored to primary care. Knowing what clinical symptoms DO indicate a positive serological test may be more important than an overall summary of what testing is getting done.

* There appears to be a word missing at the end of line 180.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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