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**Reviewer's report:**

Minor Essential Revision

The manuscript is a trove of information. Very well done. The following points are minor tweaks that are required in my opinion.

Page 7: Please improve explanation on how many isolates were tested in respect to the TOTAL of cases reported for the whole period. It is not that all clear

Page 7: Data Bias. Please consider analyzing the data with and without 2010-2011 data. There are not representative of the trends that year and might skew the data if placed in the right bin.

Page 8 Line 15: (J42... etc.) Please clarify what is these. They are assigned codes, but the reader will not get to see that until after diving into the supplementary data.

**Results:**

Page 11: The population sample is biassed. Look at the % of aboriginal in your sample compared to that in the general population. These needs to be better taken into account in all your analysis, or at least explained better if you did it.

Page 11 Lines 14 to 18: The paragraph needs to be rewritten for clarity. And this comment is somehow connected to the one in page 7 (refer to the total of cases)

Tables 2-4 Need formatting or re-structuring. The p value should not be another row or at least a differentiated one.

The statistical models used are a major point that influences the data interpretation and your conclusions. In results you want to spend some more time explaining it, the coefficients and their meanings. There is nothing here about it. This part is essential for a reader to replicate your analysis.
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