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Reviewer's report:

Congenital toxoplasmosis is an important problem in Brazil and more studies are urgently needed. The finding that treatment prevent severe disease is important.

The presentation of the data in this study is confusion and needs a thorough revision. The paper also needs a thorough language revision.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. The manufacturer of the diagnostic assays used should be stated.

2. The screening algorithm should be explained more clearly. As I understand the women were tested for antibodies against T.gondii in the first or early second trimester, and those with a positive IgM test treated ? Is that correct ? Then serogenative women had a test at birth or was it both serogenative women in the first trimester and the newborn or were newborns only tested if the women tested positive?

3. The authors have many definitions of congenital toxoplasmosis and many different outcomes (see table 1-3). The data would be much easier to understand if the outcome were presented separately for women who seroconverted between the 1st trimester sample and the sample at birth and those diagnosed based on a pos. IgM in the first trimester.

4. The sentence in the results action "57 seronegative babies of women who did not follow serological surveillance developed congenital toxoplasmosis" makes no sense. If children have congenital toxoplasmosis, they can not be toxoplasma serogenative. This statement confuses the entire paper, and is a serious flaw which most payable is just a linguistic misunderstanding.

5. Never the less it is again stated in tables 1 - 3 that children with different symptoms are "seronegative". Children with congenital toxoplasmosis can not be seronegative.

6. When the points raised above have been addressed the statistics probably need to be recalculated.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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