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Reviewer's report:

The authors have made many of the suggested changes. The manuscript has substantially improved but I still have a few concerns:

Line 224 and Table 4: The authors say that high distance between patients' house and Pasteur Institute of Dakar (≥ 2 hours) was a risk factor for a partial PEP. However, it is incorrect. Those living at ≥ 2 hours from the institute were LESS likely to get a partial PEP. The results are unintuitive. Please double check and discuss the results in the discussion section.

Line 226: Describe the type of exposure. The table results suggest that those with only scratches or simple contact/licking were LESS likely to get a partial PEP (i.e. were more likely to get a full course of PEP). Again the results are unintuitive. Please double check and discuss the possible reasons.

Line 227: Again the authors mention that immunoglobulins administration at D0 was significant, but actually, if NO immunoglobulin was administered at D0 then the patients were more likely to get a partial PEP. Please reword. However, the line 234 is correct.

Lines 259-260: This is not consistent with the results of the final model.

Surprisingly, the authors did not discuss the results from the regression models. Suggest discuss results from both the univariable and the multivariable models - compare your results with previous findings and discuss their implications.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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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?
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