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Reviewer’s report:

This interesting case report strengthens the accepted role of tick exposure and bites in the transmission of SFTSV to patients who subsequently present with SFTS. The manuscript does this by confirming a link between an SFTSV-infected H. longicornis tick and a patient with SFTS. The findings are clear and well presented.

Some issues to be addressed by the authors:

Normal ranges cell counts and biochemical parameters in blood and CSF should be included.

The potential of cross contamination of the tick lysate by amplicons from the patient samples should be discussed if RT-PCR was undertaken in the same lab. Also the possibility that the patient’s blood was the source of the SFTSV detected in the tick, especially given the high level viraemia detected in the patient, rather than tick to patient transmission, should be acknowledged.

What is the accepted incubation period from tick bite to onset of SFTS and is this in keeping with the on-going presence of the tick thought to be responsible for the transmission of the virus. What is the normal feeding time (period of attachment) of H. longicornis before detachment.

The limited sequencing of the M and S segments suggested but can't be said to confirm that the 2 viruses were identical. Was the region sequenced variable or conserved regions of the M and S segments.

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.

No

**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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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