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Reviewer's report:

The article submitted recounts experiences with VZV infection in a hospital setting and provides local seroprevalence data. It is informative and generally well written.

TITLE: The title should be shortened and be factual. Please remove "time for a change lesson learnt".

ABSTRACT: The background section should be shortened and the results section should be extended. In the results section, PPV and NPV should not be abbreviated. The conclusion section should be shortened and generalisations should be avoided. The finding that there was no definite relationship between VZV immunity and self-reported history should be developed and clarified.

INTRODUCTION: Line 20 delete "all students of medical field".

METHODS: For the ELISA kit used to determine VZV immunity the cut-off criteria should be given. A reference should be provided which describes the performance of the kit. The specificity of the test should be stated.

RESULTS: The authors should consider including the statistical (95%) confidence intervals of the seroprevalence data described.

DISCUSSION: The authors state that there was no definite relationship between immunity and self-reported history of varicella. They need to explain reasons for this finding in their healthcare worker population. They should also review how their findings compare with those of others in the published literature.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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