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**Author’s response to reviews:**

**Editor Comments:**

1. Please address the comments provided by reviewer 1 and 2. These can be found below.

Addressed.

2. Please amend the statement in the "Consent for publication" section, as this refers to consent obtained to publish potentially-identifying information (of patients/participants). If your manuscript does not contain any individual person’s identifiable data or information, please state “Not applicable” under this section.

The statement has been amended to “not applicable”
3. In the Availability of data and materials section please clearly state who should be contacted if someone wants to request the data.

The amendment to contact the corresponding author with the contact email has been added.

4. Please include a statement in the Authors' contributions section to the effect that all authors have read and approved the manuscript, and ensure that this is the case.

The statement has been included.

5. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

Clean version of the manuscript has been uploaded.

BMC Infectious Diseases operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Reviewer reports:

Ranjan Premaratna, MD FRCP (Reviewer 2): "Even though the mite does not transmit scrub typhus from a pet, the presence of a pet in the house may increase the presence of mites in the vicinity of the house."
Suggest to reword the above sentence to read as: "Although household pets have not been demonstrated to harbor mites transmitting scrub typhus, our study has demonstrated significant association of pets within the patients compared to controls, study of pets especially dogs and the likelihood of their harboring vectors such as ticks or mites that have a potential for transmitting scrub typhus may need further study."

The suggested reworded sentence has been included in the study.

Vaddambal Gopalakrishna Manjunath, MBBS, DCH, DNB (Reviewer 3): Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

1. As vector survey was not a part of case control study, it is better to remove it from the title.

We have removed the vector survey from the title.

2. What was the maximum distance from which the neighbourhood controls were selected is not mentioned or defined. This may influence the vector / mite density and even the socio-economic status, lifestyle practices.

The distance was not defined and as per the methodology we used to obtain the controls as detailed in the methods, the distance would be less than a few hundred metres. We don’t expect significant differences in the socio-economic status or lifestyle practices among the controls.

3. Socio-economic status (SES), the classification / scoring used to define the groups is not mentioned.

We have included the reference for the SES in the methods section.