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Reviewer’s report:

General
The authors make a remarkable improvement in the 2nd manuscript. After carefully reading, this manuscript however needs some modifications as follow;

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Inclusion criteria: line 6-10 --> revise

After reading, I am not clear in No. 3. I presume that the authors took the sera for Toxoplasma testing from these healthy blood donors after they were screened and freed from HIV, HICV, HBV, or VDRL infections prior to blood donation. (if anything is more than this, please clarify).

3. regardless...... --> remove
It is more appropriate to include all donors who showed seronegative for HIV status and other blood-borne diseases.

Line 7-8, 9-10

From line 7-8 --> total blood donors are 432 from 2 blood banks
Line 9-10 --> None….., and in total 342 ……> ??

Discussion

The authors should avoid using too many “may” in the same sentence or in one paragraph. The content of this part should be logically proven to the readers.

1st paragraph; line 4-9 --> summarize these sentences
2nd paragraph; line 5-6; This finding ….our finding --> combine (This deserves further study in which additional results might agree or challenge our finding).
Line 10-11 --> revise (too many “may”)

Line 16-17, In contrast, since ......city --> remove (it would be better to replace with the reasons to support why further study needs to be done in female donors, particularly during reproductive period associated with seronegative or seroconversion).

Line 23-25 --> revise (any studies were agree or contrarily with this finding sine we know that this is one of the significant contributing factors toward acquiring Toxoplasma infection).

Line 26 --> Other blood .........with infection --> remove

3rd paragraph; line 11-12, but...may...infection. Therefore...may...exists. --> revise

-----------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
It would be better to standardize the word Toxoplasma or Toxoplasma gondii --> italic
Materials and Methods

Laboratory test

Add “unit” of Toxoplasma serotiter

Statistical analysis

The authors gave full description of the comparative analysis. How about simple analysis such as mean, median, frequency or percentage?

Table 1, 2, and 3 -- out of how many total number of blood donors (avoiding confusion).

Table 1 --> Occupation
Non labourer --> Professional, businessman, and employee
Labourer --> Farmer and worker in factory or construction areas.
Other/unemployed --> student and housewife

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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