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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions
None

Minor Essential Revisions
The authors made important improvements in all sections, including:
- useful contextual details added to the Introduction,
- a more detailed Methods section with the use of meta-analysis techniques
- Results and discussion modified accordingly.

While most answers from the authors are convincing, I still have two minor comments.

In the methods section, it is stated that the meta-analysis was conducted on two sub-groups, namely adults and pregnant women. However, the results shown (Fig 2 and 3) are quite unclear, because it seems at first from the text that those figures refer to the adults subgroup (it is stated 'people'), whereas the title of the Fig 2 is "Adults before 2000" and Fig 3 is "Pregnant women since 2000"; aren’t two figures missing? (presumably, adults since 2000 and pregnant women before 2000?). Please clarify

Second, an interesting flow diagram of included studies has been added, but it may be a bit more detailed and clearer (e.g. arrows 'going out' for excluded studies; see Toy et al. BMC Infectious Diseases 2011, 11:337 as an example).

Discretionary Revisions
None.
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