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Reviewer's report:

This is an important piece of research and methodology to highlight the issues of misclassification bias introduced through analyses of existing data sets and the interpretation of these data. There is a well stated need for this piece of work as it is used by local, national and international policy makers and advisors for monitoring, surveillance and policy. I was able to find other methodological papers using this approach and there is significant gap in the literature which this paper fills. The methodology, with the additional appendix, is well described and justified and there are good descriptors for the non-specialist audience to understand the approach and why it was adopted. I am not an expert in this approach so cannot comment further on its validity. However it's application would appear to be appropriate and just. The results are presented well with good use of figs and tables. Is there an option of expand fig 1 so the scale on the y-axis allows the readers to see the variation between 0.1 by increasing the scale? The substantial discussion is well presented and good ref to the literature. There would appear to be some key recommendations which could be emphasised further by the authors if word count allows though there is significant wording already so this is not mandatory but could be added. A very well written, conducted and presented study of local and global importance especially for monitoring, surveillance and policy.
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