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Reviewer's report:

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.

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).

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?

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

Page 21: Line 541. Reference 78 is incomplete.

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?)

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.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
Yes

**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.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Acceptable
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