**Reviewer's report**

**Title:** Diagnostic behaviour of general practitioners when suspecting Lyme disease: a database study from 2010-2015

**Version:** 1  **Date:** 08 Nov 2017

**Reviewer:** François Milord

**Reviewer's report:**

The authors have made important improvements to the manuscript based on comments received. Here are a few additional suggestions.

Lines 148-149: Because no statistic tests were performed, this sentence should be changed. Also, I would put forward practices that perform less tests. "There was a tendency for practices with lower serological testing rates to have higher positive tests rates."

Lines 224-226: This sentence should be changed because percentage of serological testing in Table 2 has been modified. For example, "Episodes in which patients presented with nonspecific complaints like fatigue and headache were most frequently followed by serological testing."

Line 345: Change title for "Serology requests and positive test rate in LB-related episodes per general practices." A note indicates the meaning of the orange line already.

Table 2: I would like to understand why the number of serological testing were modified during the revision for the general, neurological and musculoskeletal symptoms categories. Did the authors find errors when they revised their data? The differences are quite obvious. For example, for II.Neurological symptoms, there are now 207 tests done compared to 279 in the previous version. There are also a few positive immunoblot test result that change categories, although the total stayed the same. For example, for V.Psychological, there are now 15 positive results compared to 14 before. These changes raise questions about the analysis of the links between registered reasons for encounter and serological testing, particularly for categories I, II and III.

Finally, I thank the authors for the new Appendices and Figure 3. These additions are very useful.
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