Reviewer's report

Title: Invasive meningococcal disease epidemiology and control measures: a framework for evaluation

Version: 2 Date: 24 January 2007

Reviewer: Sally Blower

Reviewer's report:

General

I note that the authors have chosen to ignore the main compulsory revisions that I suggested.

My main concern is still that the authors state that the emphasis of their paper is to describe a model and not to present results. This is an unusual way to write a modeling paper.

Firstly, if the main objective is to describe a model then it is essential that the authors present (as I said previously) a detailed sensitivity analysis of their model in order that readers may assess the appropriate validity of their model structure and assumptions. A detailed sensitivity analysis is especially important when a very complex model (such as the model in this paper) is presented.

Furthermore, I remain unconvinced that it is appropriate to write a modeling paper that only describes the structure of a model and presents very few results. I would urge the authors to present substantially more results. Details of the model structure and assumptions could then be presented in an Appendix or Supplementary Information as is common when writing a modeling paper based upon a complex model.

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

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

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

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)