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**Author’s response to reviews:**

Dennis Shanks (Reviewer 1): This review does not contain anything new in either material or analysis. It is written in journalistic style and might be appropriate for a general readership without specific infectious disease interests.

Response: While we appreciate that this review does not contain any new or novel analyses, the purpose of it was to provide a perspectives-style reflection on the 1918 influenza pandemic for the broad scientific readership of BMC Infectious Diseases as we mark the centennial of this event.

Michael Waller, Ph.D. (Reviewer 2): This is a well written and interesting summary of the 1918-1919 Pandemic.

Please consider the following minor comments.

Page 5: Line 88: The reader is 'left hanging' by the mention of the "suspicious" re-emergence. I suggest the authors report what was considered "suspicious" about this event.

Response: We appreciate the reviewer’s comments and have addressed this with additional information in the manuscript.

Page 9: Line 173 onwards: I suggest the authors provide some more justification / references supporting the hypothesis that the 'third wave' was distinct from the 'second wave' (especially given the overlapping nature of these events).
Response: As with the previous comment, we appreciated the reviewer’s attention to this detail and have addressed this in the revised manuscript.

Page 10: Is the large scale deployment of males between the ages of 16-44, (plus poor health and sanitation during war, as outlined on Page 6) also a possible contributor to the elevated mortality in these ages?

Response: While we appreciate that the reviewer is likely correct in regards to this, prior literature suggests that this phenomenon was likely due to lack of pre-existing immunity in this segment of the population. We have added in a reference for this.

Page 16: Line 331. Is the implication here that the vaccination rate of 30-36% is not sufficient? If so make this clearer.

Response: This was a great comment and we have added information to this statement for clarity along with the appropriate reference.

Page 21: Line 541. Reference 78 is incomplete.

Response: This has been corrected.

Figure 3: Include in the title (legend) what the source population/sample was for this graph. (e.g. Is this based on observed data from a particular country / region / occupational setting?).

Response: We have added in references to the Figure Legend but also note that this includes “influenza and pneumonia-related deaths from the United States”.

Annette Regan (Reviewer 3): This article summarizes a history of influenza pandemics and recent advances in our knowledge of the 1918 "spanish" influenza pandemic. This review is timely, given we have now entered the 100th year following the 1918 pandemic. The information is relevant and outlines important considerations for future pandemic preparedness. Overall, I really enjoyed reading this review and I would recommend it for publication in BMC Infectious Diseases.
I have only one substantive comment, in that the burden figures outlined in the introduction would now be considered outdated. The authors may wish to include reference to more recent global figures published by Iuliano and colleagues on 2017 (https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(17)33293-2/fulltext).

Response: We greatly appreciate this comment and have updated our data and the reference in the introduction accordingly.