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**Reviewer's report:**
This is a well written and good study. I only have a few minor points to improve the manuscript.

1. Lines 139-140: Please clarify "self-report history of dengue diagnosis" as dengue many manifest in non-specific manners. E.g. an answer to "Have you had dengue?" will be very different from "Have you suffered up to a week of fever with aches and pains?" and "Have you had fever that may last several days to a week, and recovered?"

2. Lines 143-144: The authors stated that they were confident that the great majority of people who reported being diagnosed with dengue in 2015 should have received laboratory confirmation. This is an assertion without corroboration. Please provide facts to support this statement.

3. Lines 145-146: I am perplexed why the authors chose to study those with IgM positive in serosurvey and not those with NS1 positive during the outbreak, as IgM is known to be not very specific, with cross-reactivity to other flaviviruses, other viruses and bacteria.

4. Line 198: Please avoid using "borderline significant". It is either significant or not significant.
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