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Response letter

Dear Dr Nabyonga-Orem,

Thank you very much for accepting our manuscript PUBH-D-17-02313R2, titled “Predicting Risk of Avian Influenza A(H5N1) in Egypt: The Creation of a Community Level Metric”, for
publication in BMC Public Health as an Original Article. We are grateful to you and the reviewers for the time and attention given to our article.

We have made the requested changes to our manuscript as outlined below.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,
Ellen Geerlings
Claire Heffernan

Editor comments

1. Rephrase this sentence for clarity "However, few baseline studies have been conducted, 'which would have given insight into target audiences and segmented household producers and other stakeholders by behaviours as well as setting a baseline to measure behaviour change'.

We have changed this sentence into 'However, few baseline studies have been conducted, which would have given insight into risk behaviour of specific target groups including subsets of household producers'. See page 4; line 80-81.
2. Review the manuscript for typos (e.g. page 5 clean version - "outbreaks in "in" poultry in Egypt; page 16 - "We" this in mind respondents ) and ensure proper use of brackets. There are a few instances where you have a closing bracket but there was no opening bracket before.

We have carefully reviewed the article and removed or added brackets where appropriate. We have deleted “in”, see page 5; line 100 and changed “we” into “with”, see page 16; line 368.

3. In reference to selection of households under methodology and table 2 - There were 140 household and 39 were left out because they could not fit in the subsets. This leaves a total of 101 but in table 2 you have 82, what happened to the 19 households?

We apologize for this unnoticed typo, 39 should be 59. We have changed this on page 13; line 288-289: “As we used two criteria this meant that several households (n=59) could not be included in the subsets”.