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Reviewer's report:

In this study, Roca-Oporto et al have conducted a prospective study to assess rate and clinical impact of S.pneumoniae colonization in SOT. Their study is well written and provides useful results for clinicians dealing with these patients. It also highlights the need of increasing the vaccination rate in such population according to current recommendations.

I only have few minor comments to the paper.
- Line 140. The overall colonization rate in the study population was much lower from what expected from the literature. What are possible explanations for this difference according to authors' opinion?
- Line 160. The authors report that during the winter period 36% of isolates were resistant to azithromycin and erythromycin and 34% to clarithromycin. Given that both azithromycin and clarithromycin are first line antibiotics for CAP, it would be good to report in the main text the total percentage of isolates that expressed resistance to macrolides (either azithromycin or clarithromycin).
- Line 234-245: when talking about the resistance pattern of serotype 35B it could be worth mentioning the work of Olarte et al J Clin Microbiol. 2017 who also found a high rate of resistances in serotype 35B.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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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.
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Quality of written English
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