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Author’s response to reviews:
Reviewer #1:
Q1: title
Response should be responses
A1: Done.

Q2: background
Relationship should read relationships, also include a space between death and [1], similarly line 40 - between sunshine and [12-15]. Towards the end of the background - feature (line 50) should read features. Line 37 - replace "to develop effective control of HFMD spreading" with "to limit spread of HFMD". Line 46 - replace "at" with "following a lag of"

A2: Done.

Q3: Methods

Line 69 - replace to with the, Line 71 - clinically should read clinical, Line 95 - see space between trees and .Description, Line 130 - rewrite particularly "not lagged"

A3: Done. And we had change “… HFMD infection had highest CCF with weather factors that not lagged, except for TD and RH…” as “… HFMD infection had highest CCF with weather factors that lagged 0 month, except for TD and RH…”.

Q4: Discussion and Conclusions

Line 187 - response should read responses, Line 195 - rectify - Suzhou (Jaingsu, Line 201 - peak should be in the plural - peaks, Line 201 check the format of references throughout the whole document . [14,21-32] And Line 206 - should read peaked in November, Line 220, presents should read present, Line 238 - insert be between could and attributed, Conclusions: Line 266 - move earlier to after weeks, Line 272, replace researched with investigated, Reference no. 11 - provide a citation with the doi number; lines 405-407 - title is all in caps - be consistent.

A4: Done.

Q5: Figures

Figure 1 - insert province after Gansu. Figure: There appears to be no difference between HFMD counts and HFMD incidence? Can the authors comment on this?

A5: As review recommended, we have added province after Gansu. For the population of three study areas is relatively stable during the study period, we believe that trends of HFMD count and incidence of three study areas should not have any obvious difference in figure.

Q6: Line 30, 254
Major: Line 30 - what are the mortalities recorded from HFMD infection? I could not see this information in the paper. Line 254 - the authors outlined some limitations of the study. How do these limitations affect the overall conclusions of the study?

A6: During the study period, no death HFMD cases was reported in the three study areas. We have added this to our results. And limitations we outlined are general problems for this kind of study in published articles. HFMD data we used in this study have relatively high quality, conclusions of this study are reliable. And as limitations do not varied across three study area and study period, their effects on the overall conclusion would be limited.

Reviewer #2

Q1: Table 1 and results text - please specify that HFMD incidence are per week (if this is correct). Also, please include in title or footnote that weather variables are weekly (again, if that is correct).

A1: Done, thanks.