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Reviewer's report:

This paper describes an analysis of linked hospital and death records to estimate mortality associated with severe acute respiratory infections. The authors should be congratulated on this new revision. They have done a good job addressing previous comments and the overall aim and rationale is now much clearer. The language is also much more precise.

There are a few minor changes I would recommend before acceptance, please see below.

Abstract:
line 33- please remove "but likely underestimated true mortality....", this is not background, it is part of the discussion and is better described later in the paper.
line 33- "The surveillance system, captured in-hospital deaths"...why?
line 46- add "being" to the beginning of the sentence
line 50- remove "admission to the intensive care unit......" sentence, this is repetitive.
line 51- "respiratory illness can be fatal...", please remove. this is background.

Background:
line 55- Change to "Pneumonia and influenza remain two"?
line 63- remove sentence "These findings demonstrate how the burden from...."

The background is now much clearer and better structured, but it is still not clear how the WHO recommendations and the surveillance system fit together. Some context would be good.
Results:

line 207- for the mortality section please add a numerator and denominator for each % stated as the %'s are often referring to different denominators.

Discussion:

line 293- Perhaps add a sentence hypothesising why influenza positive cases found were higher.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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