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**Reviewer's report:**

I would like to thank the authors for this new version. I am in general satisfied with the modifications and recommend the manuscript to be accepted for publication provided that the authors address the following minor comments.

Abstract: "efficacious" is a valid but very odd choice of words. How about "efficient"?

Line 57: "to official registration of the case is 14 days" this delay surprises me. Do the authors have a reference for the reasons for such a long delay?

Line 123: "infected" -&gt; "infectious"

Line 152: "has been reported to be 5.2 days".

Figure 4B: Do you have an idea why your model seems to systematically underestimate the time it took the epidemic to reach the regions of Castilla y León and Castilla-La Mancha? Less efficient surveillance infrastructure?

Line 224: "the qualitative geographical distribution"

Line 266: The authors claim that their conclusions are robust to their choices for the values of the parameters of the model and refer the readers to Additional Information. However, on some figures in the Additional Information document, we see the "Outbreak Diff. (\%)" span from ~0% to ~100%. Could the authors provide more details of the reasons why they claim their results are robust?

**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.

Not applicable
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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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