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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript has improved a lot since the last version although I feel that some statements needs to be made more carefully. Particularly in the comparison to the years 1994-2000 when comparing the number of lineages (277-282). Given that you have only 6 foreign born patients in that study period while 42 in the more recent study period, your comparison is very skewed and these interpretations could not be made.

I understand the concerns of the reviewer. However, the limitations of the study have been widely acknowledged. Maybe to say “Some lineages, consequently, such as CAM, CAS, Turkish and URAL, were only detected in the second set of isolates” makes it the sentence less drastic.

Reviewer: Li-Hwei Sng

Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions
1. Abstract, Result, 1st paragraph: line 54. typo ".. and three clusters.."
This has been amended.
2. Background, 1st paragraph: line 80: "...at high risk to be diagnosed and treated late; and..
This has been amended.
3. Methods, MTBC Isolates, 1st Isolates, line 126 :'More in detail" - suggest using alternatives.
This has been replaced by “More specifically”. Hope it could be a more adequate term.

Discretionary Revisions
1. It would be useful to retain Table 4 from the original manuscript, as a reference throughout the paper.
The Table which was previously numbered 4 has been included again as Table 2.