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Reviewer's report:

General: Overall this is an important paper as congenital toxoplasmosis can be serious and it is important to prevent it if possible. This paper adds to the literature illustrating the fact that the prevalence of T.gondii infections varies widely around the world and differs in the way it is transmitted.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached) I do not have any real major compulsory revisions, however I do have few suggestions regarding the organization of the paper
1. The discussion is far too long and some of it should be in the background. Remember that the discussion section is to discuss the results! paragraphs 1 and 2 in the discussion should be in the background. You can just briefly say that the current seroprevalence was the same as ref..... You should put the description of the Canadian study after your discussion of the water. You should also put the description of the studies about meat as well as the cats in the background and refer to them in the discussion in relation to your study
2. I have a problem with the conclusion. You say that in your study you found a high risk of toxoplasmosis in pregnant women. This is not exactly true according to your own results. In fact out of almost 400 women(770 serum samples), you did not find a single case of IgM. You should address this fact and make some kind of speculation as to why you did not find any IgM in your cohort of pregnant women. Obviously there is a higher risk in Turkey per se as compared to some other countries and this could result in a higher risk for pregnant women, however you did not find this the case in your study. I found your paper to be well written up until the conclusion which needs to be reworked not only to read better but also to include the information mentioned previously. Keep in mind that many readers only read the conclusion, so it is most important that your take home message is included

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: No
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