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Author’s response to reviews:
(Reviewer 3): Comments Arising from Past Review Comments

Major Revision #4:
The authors may wish to include their explanation on not performing statistical analysis due to the low number of cases in the prose.
Author’s response: Explanation added on the text as suggested by the reviewer (line 292).

Major Revision #7:
The authors must provide scientific evidence, either through earlier work or reported literature, which show that the circulating virus does not evolve enough to justify a more robust sequencing. Alternatively, the authors may provide statistical justification for their choice of a small sample size of 12. As a last option, the authors will need to increase their sample size. The
authors should also describe in their "Methods" section how these 12 representative strains were selected.

Author’s response: The information was added as requested (line 308).

New Major Revision
1. Line 164: The authors should describe how the 8 dengue and 8 severe dengue samples were selected for viremia quantitation. Similar to the above comment, a total sample size of 16 is too small. Scientific justification for this small sample size is required.

Author’s response: Information was added as requested (Line 167).

New Minor Revision
1. Line 114: Remove "(DwoWS)" as it is not used anywhere else in the manuscript.

Author’s response: Corrected as suggested by the reviewer.

2. Line 171-172: The authors should include the temperature at which the heat-mediated dissociation method was performed.

Author’s response: Information added as suggested by the reviewer.

3. Line 273: The percentage for the detection rate of anti-DENV IgM by ELISA is different from that stated in Table 2.

Author’s response: Corrected as suggested by the reviewer.

4. Line 283: The percentage for NS1 capture ELISA detection rate is different from that stated in Table 2.

Author’s response: Corrected as suggested by the reviewer.

5. Line 285: NS1 detection rate after heat immune complex dissociation is different from that stated in Table 2.

Author’s response: Corrected as suggested by the reviewer.

6. Figure 2: The "shadings" for the histogram bars are wrong.

Author’s response: The figure was corrected.