Reviewer's report

**Title:** Immunity status of adults and children against poliomyelitis virus type 1 strains CHAT and Sabin (LSc-2ab) in Germany

**Version:** 2  **Date:** 21 June 2010

**Reviewer:** Silvio Tafuri

**Reviewer's report:**

Dear editor,

I’m very grateful for the opportunity to review the paper: Immunity status of adults and children against poliomyelitis virus type 1 strains CHAT and Sabin (LSc-2ab) in Germany.

I read the paper with great interest. The subject is relevant and I recommend the publication on BMC Infectious Disease.

Attached find my comments:

**Major revision**

The paper aims to assess the potential differences between Sabin oral poliovirus vaccine type 1 strain and CHAT when they were used for virucidal text.

The paper is well written but before the publication I recommend to specified the role of the polio virucidal text in public health. In 1988 the World Health Assembly resolved to eradicate poliomyelitis worldwide by the year 2000. Serologic surveys of immunity to poliovirus are key to monitoring progress towards polio eradication as well as evaluating potential changes in population immunity resulting from changes in polio vaccination schedules. Now that the global eradication of wild poliovirus is almost within sight, planning for the post-certification era is becoming a priority issue. Seroepidemiological studies must be performed in polio-free countries, as Germany, and appropriate tests must be available.

Methods of sample enrolment must be clarified.

Did the authors obtained ethical approval to perform their survey? Did they requested signed and informed consent before obtain the sera? They also enrolled some children. It is very important to know if the Helsinki declaration has been observed.

How was vaccination status assessed in these subjects? was it by card? history? this needs to be clearly stated.

**Minor revision**

1. Title. The title is not appropriate. You did not perform a seroepidemiological study.

2. Abstract. In methods section I suggest to delete reference [1]. It is not
necessary in the abstract. In results section you must explain your main results.

3. Figures. I suggest to use “GMT” instead of “geometric mean titer”

**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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