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**Reviewer's report:**

**Major Compulsory Revisions:**

- As pointed out in my original review and supported by Prof. Yamada's comment 4, I do not think that the conclusion of this article is correct as I don't see any evidence that a vCJD case could be captured. There has never been one in Belgia, none of the neurologists there have seen one before and even then only a limited proportion would refer the case to the surveillance system. I think that you pointed out very nicely that the system is capable of finding trends in CJD incidence. Why not be more critical about the second aim? It doesn't change the quality of research you did, but on the other hand - at least I think - the manuscript cannot be accepted with this conclusion as it stands as it is not true.

- Confidence intervals for ORs need to be added. Again, you should specify that your OR for age ist the OR per year increase in age

**Minor essential revisions:**

- 27 sentences in a row in the Methods section start with "We.." (seperated by 3 sentences starting with "For..., we").

- lines 187 and 190: familial history of CJD is described to show both a significant upward and downward trend

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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