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**Reviewer's report:**

My only comment is that I still believe the treatment of the serotype 1 efficacy issue in the discussion needs to be revised to avoid misleading readers, despite the authors’ revision. This is because the authors first discuss the Gambia trial results, but then write, "In addition, meta – analysis of the efficacy of serotype 1 against invasive pneumococcal disease shows no evidence of protection, although only two trials have assessed this and total numbers of cases remained small [26]." But one of the two trials is the Gambia trial just discussed! And the other trial pointed in the opposite direction, in favor of protection. In other words, the phrasing "in addition" implies that the metanalysis provides additional information point against efficacy for serotype 1, whereas it is essentially a restatement of what they just wrote.

**What next?:** Accept after minor essential revisions

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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