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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posted by the authors well defined?
The question posted by the authors is well defined and are important for the serosurvey of Rubella infection, in the country with no routine vaccination.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described and are sufficient details provided to replicate the work?
The prevalence of rubella-specific IgG antibody was assessed using the method widely reported in literature, but explain better the modification about some steps (conjugate incubation time).

3. Are the data sound and well controlled?
The data don’t sound well and the authors should report the subject characteristics (sex and age). See below

However the authors should indicate if the study was submitted and approved by an ethical committee.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
The manuscript is relevant and according to the seroprevalence studies.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Under the section minor comments below are the answers to these issues.

6. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
See the comments below

Some corrections are suggested in the Abstract, Introduction, Results, Table and Figures, Discussion and References.

7. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes, the writing is acceptable.

Minor Essential Revisions:

Abstract-results section: the data reported in this section are not the same in the Results. Which percentage of seronegativity rates is correct? 41.5% (4-6 years) or 49%, 6.2% or 6% (14-10 years)?
Results:
The results shown in this section should be the same reported in the abstract and in the discussion too. We suggest a general revision in the exposition of data: the authors may report always the seronegativity or seropositivity, in order to give a more clear explanation of their results.

Table 1,: we suggest a different title for this table, for example "Characteristics of study subjects", we suggest, also, to integrate it with the sex and age of subjects.
Pg 3 line 19: The sentence may be modified "Rubella seropositivity increased with the age"
Pg 3 line 20-21: The sentence is not in a clear English form.
The authors have to check the numbers of figures, 1 and 2.

Discussion
The authors should compare their results with others studies, more recent, carried out in other counties.


At last, the authors should conclude the discussion explaining if their results can give some directive about the rubella vaccination strategy.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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