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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer’s report
Title: Return of pandemic H1N1 influenza virus
Version: 1 Date: 23 October 2014
Reviewer: Kin On Kwok
Comment: Reviewer’s report:
A comprehensive introduction was written to initiate the motive of the study.
However, there were still many unclear descriptions and wordings throughout the
main-text
A) Minor revision
In terms of wordings, I have following comments
The text in the manuscript should not be written as short form
e.g. line 104 lab should be written as laboratory
Response: Corrected

Comment: line 121 significantly ---> relatively?
Response: Corrected

Comment: In line 137 "Patients of different ages are infected" is a sub section
       title
Response: Corrected

Comment: and in line 150 "Pregnant women are particularly sensitive to
       A(H1N1)pdm09
       infection" and they should be in noun form
Response: Sorry but I did not understood this comment

Comment: line 166 the increased?
Response: Corrected

Comment: In terms of the figures, I have following comments
For the order of the figure, I wonder why figure 2 and 4 was mentioned before figure 1 and figure 3 in the main text.
Response: Figure 2 and 4 was mentioned before of figure 3 only in the “Methods” section because different statistical analysis was used in each of these figures. In the “Results” section the figure numbers are appeared as they should be first 1 then 2 etc.

Comment: In figure 1, x-axis corresponds to week of the year. The numbers marked in x-axis in year 2009 (8,14,20,26,32) are different from the numbers marked in year 2010,2011, 2012 and 2013. Can the author make some edits on the charts so the readers of this paper are able to have thorough understanding on the positive rate in different time periods.
Response: Figure was corrected as requested

Comment: In figure 1, x-axis corresponds to week of the year. The numbers marked in x-axis in year 2009 (8,14,20,26,32) are different from the numbers marked in year 2010,2011, 2012 and 2013. Can the author make some edits on the charts so the readers of this paper are able to have thorough understanding on the positive rate in different time periods.
Response: Figure was corrected as requested

Comment: The figure legend in figure 2 is not clear
Response: Corrected

Comment: figure 2a is the percentages of .... at the peak
Response: The percentages at the peak of infection of each year. We now mention this in the figure legends

Comment: figure 2b is annual percentages ??"..... at the peak (a) of the 356 infection period and annually (b)."
Response: The percentages of each year. We now mention this in the figure legends

Comment: In figure 3, I wonder why 2010-2012 was considered as one category to look at the positive rate for pregant individuals instead of two categories 2010-2011 and 2011-2012.
Response: Only few patients were infected with the pandemic influenza between 2010-2012. Thus, there was no point to divide this period into two. We mention this in the text rows 144-145.

Comment: The word "Pregnancy" can be taken away from the y-axis and the author can provide the information of that in the
Response: Corrected

Comment: figure 4 legend The title of legend 4 should be noun for example The percentage of positive cases for pregnant women.
Response: Corrected

Comment: The sentence "Pregnant women are especially vulnerable to the pandemic 2009 virus" should be in main text.
Response: We now cite it also in the main text, line 118.

Comment: figure Legend 5 The numbers indicate the different subgroups of the pandemic influenza viruses
Response: We add the following sentence to the legends for clarification: The HA genes of H1N1 viruses cluster into eight genetic groups defined by amino acid substitution in HA1.

Comment: "the" should be taken away
Response: Corrected

Comment: In terms of the table presentation, I have following suggestions
It is suggested to widen the width of the column.
Response: Corrected

Comment: In table 1, 120 4 in the column HA reverse corresponds to 1204?
Response: Corrected

Comment: In table 2, sig. should be p-value ?
Response: Corrected

Comment: In terms of statistical tools, 95% confidence interval is referring to binomial confidence interval (line 104)?
Response: Correct, Binomial 95% confidence interval was performed.

For the rest of statistical analysis, I am fine.

Major revision

Comment: In the discussion section, I expect the first paragraph is to restate the main findings rather than repeating the contents mentioned already in the introduction.
Response: Corrected

Comment: In line 163 to 166
"A simple logistic regression analysis showed that within the group of pregnant women, no differences in the ages of the infected women were noticed throughout the year" I expect most of the pregnant women should be in the age 21-45. What is the age distribution of pregnant women.
Response: Correct, the women were indeed of age 21-45. We analyzed whether within this age group differences were observed in the different years.

Comment: As in figure 3, 21-40 and 41-60 contributes a lot of infection from 2009
and 2013. I wonder whether it is due to the age effect? Do you mean age (say 21-45) cannot explain the infection among the pregnant women? Are you using continuous age as the exposure variable?

Response: Correct, we used continuous age as the exposure variable.

Comment: Can you present this logistic regression as a supplementary table?
Response: Logistic regression is presenting now as supplementary table 3.

Comment: I suggest to construct the main table with demographics say age, sex and % positive in different years.
Response: As requested, we added new Table 2 to the revised manuscript. There was no point to mention the demographic area because Israel is very small and all patients are from the same demographic area.

Comment: # Level of interest:
An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests.
Response: No response in needed here

Comment: Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Response: The manuscript was edited by a native English speaker.

Comment: Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
Response: We responded above

Comment: Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests
Response: No response in needed here