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Dear Editor,

Please find attached our revised manuscript entitled "Acute diarrhea in adults consulting a general practitioner in France during winter: incidence, clinical characteristics, management and risk factors (MS: 1129034223134684)."

We thank the two reviewers for their comments, which helped us improve our manuscript. As requested, we addressed their comments and we have taken into account their suggestions.

Yours sincerely,

Christophe ARENA

On behalf of all the authors
Reviewer's report

Title: Acute diarrhea in adults consulting a general practitioner in France during winter: incidence, clinical characteristics, management and risk factors.

Version: 1 Date: 24 July 2014

Reviewer: Tung G Phan

Reviewer's report:

The manuscript describes the incidence, clinical characteristics, management and risk factors of acute diarrhea in adults consulting a general practitioner in France during winter. It is an interesting manuscript. There are two comments:

1. Are these feces samples tested for bacteria and parasites?

   These feces samples were not tested for bacteria and parasites and this point has been specified in the discussion now in lines 240 to 243: “The feces samples were not screened to rule out bacterial and parasitic infections. However, we included patients in whom there was a very high suspicion of viral diarrhea (and a very low risk of bacterial or parasitic infection), as inclusions were done during winter and cases with an obvious non-viral etiology of diarrhea were excluded.”

2. There are not any genetic analyses of viruses found in the feces samples. Any explanations?

   We stored aliquots of these samples and the genetic analyses will be done later for another research.
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Reviewer's report:

This is a well written manuscript, especially considering the fact that clinico-epidemiological studies on viral diarrhea in adults are limited. Only a few minor corrections are required. The length of the manuscript could be shortened.

The methods and results sections have been shortened.

Minor essential revisions

1. Abstract: line 49, mention the months of the study period.

We mentioned the months (lines 50-51).

2. Abstract: line 59, mention the names of the enteric viruses.

We mentioned the names of the enteric viruses (lines 54-56).

3. Abstract: line 60, mention the rate of detection of noroviruses (%).

We mentioned the rate of detection of noroviruses (line 63).

4. Background: line 77 "mainly due to...".

We replaced “due mainly to...” by “mainly due to…” (line 80).

5. Background: line 86, rephrase the sentence, in the present form it might confuse the reader.

We replaced the sentence by “However, in this study, microbiological investigations were not required, and the results were presented for all age groups and not specifically for adults.” (lines 88-90).

6. Methods: lines 109-110, "from 2010w49 to 2011w17 and from 2011w49 to 2012w17" make it clear for readers to understand.

We replaced these lines by “The study was conducted over two consecutive winters from the 49th week of 2010 (2010w49) to 2011w17 and then from 2011w49 to 2012w17.” (lines 107-108).
7. Although the objective was to look into viruses in these samples, why the samples were not screened to rule out bacterial infection?

As stated above, the feces samples were not screened to rule out bacterial and parasitic infections. This was because we included patients in whom there was a very high suspicion of viral diarrhea (and a very low risk of bacterial or parasitic infection), as inclusions were done during winter and cases were excluded in case of an obvious non-viral etiology of diarrhea: traveler’s diarrhea (this characteristic has been unintentionally deleted from the first version of the manuscript in line 117, we apologize for this), recent use of antibiotics, colchicine, non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, laxatives, recent administration of chemotherapy or radiotherapy. This point has been specified in the discussion now (lines 240 to 243).

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

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published. *We used a professional language editing service to improve the style of written English.*

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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