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Reviewer's report:
Abstract - 1st para, what do the authors mean by 'laboratorial aspects'?
Results - it's unclear what the authors mean by 'distinct groups' - please elaborate

Title should read 'case characterization' not 'cases'
Background - page 4, line 78: give the species name of the vector
Page 5, line 95 - replace with 'despite being known as a mild serotype'
Page 5, line 98 - replace with 'occurring'
Page 5, line 99 - replace with 'laboratory' instead of 'laboratorial'
Page 9, lines 202 - can you explain in the Methods section what adding an antigen-antibody complex dissociation step involved?
Page 9, line 204 - observed IN females (not ON)
Table 2 - is the p-value column needed there?
Table 3 - in 2011, the number of samples is very small and so the % may simply be an artefact of that. That needs to be mentioned in the Results text.
Table 4 - can it be explained in the legend why there is only one p-value (test) in the upper part of the Table and which factors are being tested? It's unclear currently.
Figure 4 - what are A and B? It's not mentioned in the legend.
Figures are generally of very low resolution.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Needs some language corrections before being published
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