



HAL
open science

Are measles, mumps and rubella a public health issue in young adults? Results from a seroprevalence survey in university students in Italy

Elisa Langiano, Maria Ferrara, Giuseppe Torre, Liana Lanni, Patrizia Atrei, Giuseppe Martellucci, Elisabetta Vito

► To cite this version:

Elisa Langiano, Maria Ferrara, Giuseppe Torre, Liana Lanni, Patrizia Atrei, et al.. Are measles, mumps and rubella a public health issue in young adults? Results from a seroprevalence survey in university students in Italy. *Journal of Public Health*, 2010, 18 (5), pp.443-451. 10.1007/s10389-010-0324-z . hal-00521086

HAL Id: hal-00521086

<https://hal.science/hal-00521086>

Submitted on 25 Sep 2010

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Editorial Manager(tm) for Journal of Public Health
Manuscript Draft

Manuscript Number: JOPH-D-09-00054R2

Title: Are measles, mumps and rubella a Public Health issue in young adults? Results from a seroprevalence survey in university students in Italy. Dr. Elisa Langiano, Dipartimento di Scienze Motorie e della Salute - Università degli Studi di Cassino - Via Sant'Angelo Località Folcara - 03043 Cassino (Fr), Italy. Tel. +39 0776 2993793, fax +39 0776 2993763, e-mail address: langiano@unicas.it

Article Type: Original Article

Corresponding Author: Dr. Elisa Langiano,

Corresponding Author's Institution: University of Cassino

First Author: Elisa Langiano

Order of Authors: Elisa Langiano; Maria Ferrara; Giuseppe La Torre; Liana Lanni; Patrizia Atrei; Giuseppe Martellucci; Elisabetta De Vito

Abstract: Aims:

A survey was conducted amongst university students to assess their level of susceptibility and knowledge of measles, mumps and rubella (MMR) diseases and their prevention, and find factors associated to the seropositivity for MMR viruses.

Subjects, and Methods:

A cross-sectional study was conducted involving 961 students from the University of Cassino (Italy). Enzyme immunoassay method was used to assess seropositivity for MMR, while knowledge and previous vaccination information were acquired through a self-administered questionnaire.

Results:

The prevalence of IgG antibodies was 93.2 % for measles, 91.4 % for mumps and 81.3% for rubella. The susceptibility for measles was higher in the 21-25 and over 31 age groups. The seroprevalence profile of mumps was similar to that of measles while the level of immunity to rubella was very low in students aged under 20 years (76.7%) and 21-25 years(81.2%). Only 111 students declared to be vaccinated against measles, 46 against mumps and 103 against rubella. Most students demonstrated poor knowledge concerning MMR and were not practicing preventive behaviours.

Conclusions:

The susceptibility was particularly high for rubella. Concerted efforts are needed to educate young adults about the benefits of vaccination and to raise their level of consciousness so as to motivate them to request vaccination.

Response to Reviewers: I have taken on the title page my complete address with Street, Postcode, Town, Telephonnumber, Faxnumber and e-mail address.

Title

Are measles, mumps and rubella a Public Health issue in young adults? Results from a seroprevalence survey in university students in Italy.

Author's name

Elisa Langiano ¹, Maria Ferrara ¹, Giuseppe La Torre², Liana Lanni ¹, Patrizia Atrei¹, Giuseppe Martellucci ³, Elisabetta De Vito ¹

Authors' affiliation:

¹*Department of Health and Sport Science, University of Cassino, Italy.*

²*Department of Experimental Medicine, Clinical Medicine and Public Health Unit, Sapienza University of Rome, Italy.*

³*Local Health Unit, Frosinone, Italy.*

E-mail address:

EL: langiano@unicas.it

MF: m.ferrara@unicas.it

GLT: giuseppe.latorre@uniroma1.it

LL: lianala@unicas.it

PA: p.atrei@unicas.it

GM: giuseppe.martellucci@alice.it

EDV: devito@unicas.it

1 **Abstract**
2

3 **Aims:**
4

5
6 A survey was conducted amongst university students to assess their level of
7
8 susceptibility and knowledge of measles, mumps and rubella (MMR) diseases and their
9
10 prevention, and find factors associated to the seropositivity for MMR viruses.
11

12 **Subjects, and Methods:**
13

14
15 A cross-sectional study was conducted involving 961 students from the University of
16
17 Cassino (Italy). Enzyme immunoassay method was used to assess seropositivity for
18
19 MMR, while knowledge and previous vaccination information were acquired through a
20
21 self-administered questionnaire.
22
23

24 **Results:**
25

26
27 The prevalence of IgG antibodies was 93.2 % for measles, 91.4 % for mumps and
28
29 81.3% for rubella. The susceptibility for measles was higher in the 21-25 and over 31
30
31 age groups . The seroprevalence profile of mumps was similar to that of measles while
32
33 the level of immunity to rubella was very low in students aged under 20 years (76.7%)
34
35 and 21-25 years(81.2%). Only 111 students declared to be vaccinated against measles,
36
37 46 against mumps and 103 against rubella. Most students demonstrated poor knowledge
38
39 concerning MMR and were not practicing preventive behaviours.
40
41
42

43 **Conclusions:**
44

45
46 The susceptibility was particularly high for rubella. Concerted efforts are needed to
47
48 educate young adults about the benefits of vaccination and to raise their level of
49
50 consciousness so as to motivate them to request vaccination.
51
52

53 **Keywords**
54

55 University students, Italy, immunization, measles, mumps, rubella.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Introduction

In Europe, the incidence rate of measles varies among countries. In some nations it is a big Public Health concern whilst in others, it is almost overcome (WHO 2003). Italy has been facing an upsurge of measles cases after an incidence rate of 1/100 000 inhabitants in 2006. Between September 2007 and May 2008, 2 079 cases were notified and the incidence rate increased to 3.4 cases/100 000 inhabitants. Using national age-specific population figures as denominators, adolescents aged 15-19 years had the highest incidence rate, namely 15.8/100 000 (EUVAV/NET 2007; Filia et al. 2008).

Regarding rubella, from January 2005 to May 2008, four Italian Regions (Lazio, Campania, Tuscany and Piedmont) reported 27 notifications of suspected congenital rubella syndrome (CRS), and in 4 cases, the diagnosis was confirmed by laboratory tests. In the same period, ten Regions reported 75 suspected cases of rubella during pregnancy (in 30 cases the diagnosis was confirmed by laboratory tests). The mean age of cases was 29 years (range 17-46 years) (Giambi et al. 2008).

Concerning mumps in Italy, an endemo-epidemic course can be observed with outbreaks every 2-4 years and its incidence had remained almost unvaried until 2001, with a range from 25.9 to 125.1 cases per 100 00 inhabitants being noted. Since 2002 cases of mumps have decreased with an incidence of 4.5 per 100 00 inhabitants in 2004 (Gabutti et al. 2008).

In Italy vaccinations for measles, mumps and rubella (MMR) are not mandatory. They were introduced separately, during the 1970s for rubella and measles, and in 1982 for mumps. No specific target for voluntary vaccinations had been set by central health authorities, and no organic policy offering this type of vaccinations existed until 1995 when the Ministry of Health (no. 13, 6 June 1995) established an active offer of MMR

1 combined vaccination, free of charge, targeting 15 month old children and started
2
3 specific informative and educational programmes (Bonanni et al. 2002).
4

5
6 The National Health Plan 1998–2000 set a 95% coverage goal for both compulsory and
7
8 recommended vaccinations. The immunisation schedule recommended that the first
9
10 dose of MMR vaccine should be given between age 12 to 15 months, and a second dose
11
12 from age 5 to 6 or from age 11 to 12 years of age (Ministerial Decree 1999). Rubella
13
14 vaccination, recommended since 1972 for pre-adolescent girls, continues to be
15
16 recommended until high levels of coverage in the second year of life are reached
17
18 (Ministry of Health 1999).
19
20
21

22
23 All described programmes have already reduced the MMR incidence in Italy but
24
25 outbreaks are still recurrent in non immune subjects. In addition, no region achieved
26
27 the target coverage of 95% with the first dose in 2006 (Filia et al. 2008; Giambi et al.
28
29 2008; Ministry of Health 2006). Furthermore, homogeneous results have not yet been
30
31 achieved in Italy (Bonanni et al. 2007; Ciofi degli Atti et al. 2006; Langiano et al. 2005;
32
33 Langiano et al. 2007) and there are great variations in the coverage value not only
34
35 among the Regions but also among Local Health Units within the same Region.
36
37 Although this situation has led to a slowdown in the circulation of viruses, values
38
39 capable of preventing their spread have not yet been reached (Ministerial Decree 1999).
40
41 This explains the shift in the average age of cases, thus exposing adolescents and young
42
43 adults to a greater susceptibility to infection (Trevisan et al. 2005).
44
45
46
47
48

49
50 In the province of Frosinone (Lazio Region – Central Italy), which has 490,000
51
52 inhabitants, MMR vaccination coverage prevalence values were 14.5% in 1995 and
53
54 have risen to 62.9% in 2000. An increase in the percentage of subjects aged 10-14 years
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 for measles cases and 15-19 year-olds for rubella cases was observed between 1995 and
2
3
4 2003 (Langiano et al. 2005; Langiano et al. 2007).

5
6 Low prevalence of positive antibodies among subjects aged about 20 years to mumps,
7
8 or measles, or rubella or to all diseases simultaneously was largely witnessed by Italian
9
10 and international studies (Langiano et al. 2005; Trevisan et al. 2005; Hamilton-West
11
12 2006; Giambi et al. 2007; Donaghy et al 2006; WHO 2005).

13
14
15 This epidemic trend and the low MMR vaccination coverage rate in this geographic area
16
17 has suggested we pay special attention to infections in young adults' because of more
18
19 important implications for population health due to more serious complications for these
20
21 individuals (Gabutti et al. 2008; Hamilton-West 2006; Presidency of the Council of
22
23 Ministers 2003; Banatvala and Brown 2004; Kare 2005; Ouhilal 2000; Langiano et al.
24
25 2009).

26
27
28 On the basis of these considerations, the aims of our study were:
29

- 30
31 a) to assess the level of susceptibility for Measles, Mumps and Rubella in a sample
32
33 of university students in order to evaluate possible windows of susceptibility
34
35 accumulating within this specific sub-population;
36
37
38 b) to find factors associated to the seropositivity for MMR viruses.
39
40
41
42 c) to examine the knowledge of these students regarding MMR diseases and their
43
44 prevention.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 **Subjects and Methods**
2

3 *Study population*
4

5 A cross-sectional study was conducted involving 961 students from the University of
6 Cassino, the only campus present in the Southern Lazio area (Central Italy). The
7 University of Cassino has about fourteen thousand students prevalently from Southern
8 Lazio and in small part from the neighbouring regions (especially Campania). The
9 student population consists of 57 % females and 43% males aged 18-44 years.
10

11 *Sampling and the questionnaire*
12

13 All students attending the Faculties of Literature and Philosophy, Economics, Law,
14 Engineering, Sport Science and the degree course of Nursing Sciences were invited to
15 participate in the survey. The only criterion of inclusion was being university students.
16 Students attending the first year were informed directly in the classroom while others
17 were informed through an invitation form sent by the secretary's office. Informed
18 consent for taking blood specimens and the use of personal data was obtained from all
19 students who participated in the survey, with data being collected using a specific form.
20 Blood samples were collected in a medical university laboratory, after which students
21 filled in the questionnaire which was specifically designed for the study and contained
22 three different areas of inquiry. The first section of the questionnaire concerned socio-
23 demographic data as age, gender, marital status, family structure and parental
24 educational level and occupation. The second section regarded information about
25 previous history of MMR diseases and previous history of MMR immunization. The
26 third section evaluated the students' knowledge about the following topics: definition of
27 MMR, transmission pathway of the infection, risk during pregnancy, risk in adulthood,
28 MMR vaccine and precautions after vaccination.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Self reported history of MMR vaccination or the Official certification of vaccination
2
3 issued by paediatricians or Local Health Agency was requested to all the participants.
4
5 Certification of the vaccination status was not a prerequisite for the study participation.
6
7

8 *Serological assay* 9

10 The concentration of human IgG antibodies for mumps, measles and rubella was
11
12 determined using a commercial ELISA immunoenzymatic test (Radim) according to
13
14 the manufacturer's instructions.
15
16

17 Enzyme immunoassay method was used for the qualitative determination of anti IgG
18
19 antibodies for measles and mumps. The calculation of results obtained by qualitative
20
21 assay, considered the optical density of each negative, positive and cut-off control.
22
23

24 For qualitative IgG detection, the cut off recommended by the producer was used
25
26 (OD>0.110): samples with optical density lower than the cut-off control were
27
28 considered non reactive (negatives), samples with optical density higher than the cut-off
29
30 control were considered reactive (positives), whilst samples with absorbance values
31
32 ranging within $\pm 10\%$ of the cut-off control were considered questionable and repeated
33
34 for confirmation. The diagnostic specificity of the method was evaluated on a
35
36 representative group of individuals with no immunity against Measles or Mumps IgG
37
38 infection and results were respectively 94.1% for Measles and 100% for Mumps. The
39
40 clinical sensitivity of the method was evaluated on a representative group of individuals
41
42 having undergone Measles or Mumps IgG infection and the results were respectively
43
44 91.2% for Measles and 95.5% for Mumps.
45
46

47 Enzyme immunoassay method was used for quantitative detection of IgG antibodies for
48
49 rubella virus. Samples with IgG values lower than 15 IU/mL were considered non
50
51 reactive for antirubella IgG antibodies (negative), samples with IgG values higher than
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 30 IU/mL were considered reactive for antirubella IgG antibodies (positive) and
2
3 samples with IgG values between 15 and 30 IU/mL were considered questionable and
4
5 repeated for confirmation in accordance with the producer's instructions indicated in the
6
7 Rubella IgG RADIM kit. In this quantitative assay, the calibrators were calibrated
8
9 against the 2nd IS WHO 67/182, 1986. The 2nd British Standard for Anti-Rubella
10
11 Serum, Human (67/182) was established by the National Biological Standards Board
12
13 (NBSB) in 1986. The diagnostic specificity of the method was evaluated on a group of
14
15 more than 100 samples with no immunity against Rubella infection and the result was
16
17 97.2%. The diagnostic sensitivity of the method was evaluated on a group of more than
18
19 200 samples having undergone past Rubella infection and the result was 100%.

25 *Statistical analysis*

27 Differences in qualitative variables among groups were assessed using the χ^2 test and a
28
29 P-value <0.05 was considered statistically significant. The logistic regression was used
30
31 to identify significant predictors of seropositivity. Results of the logistic analysis were
32
33 expressed as Odds Ratio (OR) and 95% Confidence Intervals (95% CI). Finally, three
34
35 different multivariate models, one for each outcome variable (seropositivity), were built
36
37 using the stepwise approach (backward elimination procedure).

40 Statistical analysis was carried out using the program SPSS 12.0.

50 **Results**

52 *Study population*

54 961 Students participated in the survey (7.4% of Cassino University population), with
55
56 a median age of 22.0 years (range 18-44), 86.8% female, 13.2% male, living mainly in
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 the nearby area (province of Frosinone 78.2%). The distribution according to Faculty
2 was as follows: Literature and Philosophy (28.5%), Nursing Sciences (12,1%), Sport
3 Science (8.7%), Law (6.9%), Engineering (6.0%), Economics (4.7%); non responders
4 were 33.2%.
5
6
7
8
9

10 *Seroprevalence*

11 As described in Table 1, the highest prevalence of specific IgG antibodies was detected
12 for measles (93.2%), followed by mumps (91.4%) and rubella (81.3%). Lower
13 seropositivity levels for measles and mumps were found in the ≥ 31 years age group
14 and in the 21-25 years age group. Seroprevalence for IgG antibodies against rubella was
15 always lower than 85% up to the age of 30 years, resulting particularly low in students
16 under 20 (76.7%) whilst the highest prevalence (93.6%) was seen in the ≥ 31 years
17 group. Questionable results were observed for mumps (1.1%) and for rubella (1.1%),
18 without age or gender differences
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 Only 0.3% of students had no IgG antibodies for all the three viruses under study and
33 70.4% were positive for all three diseases. No statistically significant differences in the
34 seroprevalence of positive antibodies were identified for gender for all three diseases.
35
36
37
38
39

40 *Personal history of previous MMR infections and MMR vaccination*

41 Most students interviewed declared they had had measles (63.1%), mumps (28.5%) and
42 rubella (28.6%). This fact was supported by serological assays: 96.9% for measles,
43 97.8% for mumps and 88.3% for rubella. Table 2 shows the history of the diseases
44 crossed with the laboratory results and is statistically significant for all three.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 The reporting of *unknown* was 17.9% for measles, 33.7% for mumps and 30.5% for
53 rubella. Having little or no memory of having contracted mumps or rubella could be
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 due to the fact that both these infections are characterized by a high percentage of
2 asymptomatic cases.
3

4
5
6 The majority of students who were asked to indicate whether they had had the
7 combined vaccination or any of the three single vaccine in the past, said that they were
8 not vaccinated or that they didn't remember it. Only 111 students said to be vaccinated
9 against measles, 46 against mumps and 103 against rubella. Primarily females (94),
10 aged 21-25 years (42) and under 20 years (28), resulted vaccinated against rubella. In
11 any case, we did not identify statistically significant differences among males and
12 females. Vaccination history was confirmed by serological tests in 97.3% of cases for
13 measles, 93.5% for mumps and 90.3 % for rubella. When vaccination memory and
14 serology tests were crossed, statistically significant results were seen only for measles.
15 Only a negligible percentage of subjects (<1%) documented previous immunizations
16 with the certificate issued from the Local Health Unit or the paediatrician.
17

18
19
20 The low percentage of self declared vaccinations suggests that the presence of
21 antibodies is likely to be related to natural disease. Thus, we preferred postponing the
22 analysis of other variables to further detailed study.
23

24 *General Knowledge*

25
26 As far as knowledge inferred from the questionnaire was concerned, only 2.3% of the
27 students for measles, for mumps 19.7%, and for rubella 6.9% were aware of the
28 complications of MMR infection contracted in adulthood by Only 1% of the students
29 interviewed knew that the rubella virus could cause spontaneous miscarriage. Only
30 3.3% recognized a generic risk to the foetus but to the more specific answer regarding
31 the transmission of the virus in pregnancy, the risk was perceived by most students
32 (78.0%). Only 7.8% of responders knew that an infant with CRS? is highly contagious
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 for a long time and 54.1% thought that their knowledge about rubella was insufficient.
2
3 This result confirmed the high percentage of students who did not know the Rubeo test
4
5 (43%). Regarding mumps 26.2% of students recognized a risk to pregnancy. Although
6
7 vaccination was recognized as the best prevention tool available against measles
8
9 (61.2%), mumps (56.8%) and rubella (59%), non responders to this question were quite
10
11 high (39.8%).
12
13

14
15 Age group and gender were the main independent variables associated significantly
16
17 with personal knowledge concerning MMR. The 21-25 years age group and gender
18
19 (female) influenced responses given from the interviewed regarding basic knowledge of
20
21 contagiousness of all three viruses, including transmission modality and prevention
22
23 against MMR ($p < 0.05$). Therefore only the 21-25 years age group influenced degree of
24
25 awareness regarding existence MMR vaccination.
26
27
28

29 *Univariate logistic analysis*

30
31 The logistic regression model, exemplified in Table 3, demonstrated that measles and
32
33 mumps, on the one side, and rubella on the other side, show different patterns of
34
35 predictors. In fact, while for measles and mumps the only significant predictor of
36
37 seropositivity was the region of residence (higher OR in Lazio region), being over 25
38
39 years of age and vaccination were independent predictors of seropositivity for rubella
40
41 (OR=1.72).
42
43
44
45
46

47 *Multivariable logistic analysis*

48
49 Table 3 shows the multivariable analysis, that revealed that the following variables were
50
51 predictors of seropositivity: for Measles age over 25 (OR = 2.04; 95% CI: 1.02 – 4.10),
52
53 region of residence other than Lazio (OR = 0.51; 95% CI: 0.28 – 0.90) and vaccination
54
55 against measles (OR = 2.96; 95% CI: 1.00 – 9.67); for Mumps region of residence other
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 than Lazio (OR = 0.51; 95%CI: 0.29 – 0.89); for Rubella age over 25 (OR = 1.74;
2
3 95%CI: 1.14 – 2.65) and vaccination against rubella (OR = 2.39; 95%CI: 1.18 – 4.86).
4
5
6
7

8 **Discussion**

9

10 Several surveys investigated the MMR seroprevalence in different countries in similar
11 settings and age specific profiles of MMR have shown a wide variation (Trevisan et al.
12 2005; WHO 2005; Dominguez et al. 2006). In these similar studies however, most
13 students were vaccinated and MMR vaccination coverage was higher.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 The Italian student population enrolled that was susceptible to measles (6.8%) was close
21 to the estimated European level that must not exceed in over nine years old in order to
22 eliminate this disease (Presidency of the Council of Ministers 2003; WHO 2005;
23 Ramsay 1999). Positive results according national strategies were reached for mumps
24 too (Presidency of the Council of Ministers 2003). On the other hand, the level of
25 susceptibility to rubella is very high, in all age groups tested, and was always over 5%
26 and particularly high in subjects under 25 (from 18.7% to 22.6%).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 The measles seropositivity rates in young adults found in our survey are higher than
38 those obtained in a similar study conducted in Italy (Trevisan et al. 2005), and lower
39 than those obtained in others conducted in Spain (WHO 2005; Dominguez et al. 2006).
40
41
42
43

44 The mumps seropositivity rates are higher than that obtained in Italy (Trevisan et al.
45 2005), and similar to others obtained in Spain (WHO 2005; Dominguez et al. 2006). On
46 the other hand Rubella seropositivity is always lower compared to the other European
47 studies (WHO 2005; Dominguez et al. 2006). The percentage of those reporting to have
48 had measles and were immune is very similar to the percentage reported in a study
49 carried out in Italian children born before 1990 (Grandolfo et al. 1998) but, as
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 multivariate logistic regression suggests and other surveys confirm (Baer et al 2005;
2
3 Murray and Linch 1998), historical information on measles, mumps and rubella
4
5 infection cannot be a reliable predictor.
6
7

8 The high measles seroprevalence in these mostly unvaccinated students can hardly be a
9
10 surprise. Our results are supported by a study conducted on pupils born in the late
11
12 1980s when 50% of children from 36 months in Southern Italy to 5-6 years in Northern
13
14 Italy (Grandolfo et al. 1998) achieved natural infection.
15
16

17 Although the susceptibility to measles is not very low in the population studied,
18
19 suboptimal MMR vaccination coverage in our province (Langiano et al. 2005) increases
20
21 the risk that one may contract measles. Other serological studies are needed that involve
22
23 younger cohorts because of the low vaccination coverage in the past. A probable
24
25 unvaccinated status, and fewer opportunities to acquire natural infection increase the
26
27 spread of the virus.
28
29

30 Our results underline the importance of catch-up activities among adolescents and
31
32 young adults to reduce the rate of susceptibility in this age-group and to reduce the
33
34 regional differences in vaccination coverage (Bonanni et al. 2007; Ciofi degli Atti et al.
35
36 2006; Presidency of the Council of Ministers 2003).
37
38

39 The susceptibility seen in our young adult students could expose them to a risk of
40
41 contracting measles and rubella with more serious implications (Bonanni et al. 2007;
42
43 Hamilton-West 2006). Therefore, there is a strong need to raise their level of
44
45 consciousness and to motivate them to request vaccination.
46
47

48 In the last outbreaks reported in European countries, including Italian adolescents,
49
50 young adults were particularly affected by measles, because most of the population were
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 unvaccinated or incompletely vaccinated (Filia et al. 2008; Andrews et al. 2008;
2
3 Nardone et al. 2003).

4
5
6 Outbreaks of measles, mumps and rubella in older susceptible cohorts have occurred in
7
8 Europe in the recent years and they are still occurring (Hamilton-West 2006; Andrews
9
10 et al. 2008; Sartorius et al. 2005; Schmidt et al. 2006) The cases of Mumps notified in
11
12 Italy in 2006 by the Ministry of Health confirm the susceptibility in young adults
13
14 (www.ministerosalute.it).
15

16
17
18 The herd immunity for mumps is estimated at about 75-86% (Donaghy et al. 2006), and
19
20 the theoretical level of antibodies required to interrupt the transmission of mumps is
21
22 estimated between 85% and 90% (Nardone et al.2003). Although asymptomatic
23
24 mumps infections may be more common especially in adults (Sartorius et al. 2005), the
25
26 last epidemic peak in the province of Frosinone reported 137 cases with median age of
27
28 7 vs. 285 with median age of 10 reported in 1995 (Langiano et al. 2007). In this setting,
29
30 mumps seroprevalence was always greater than 90% in all age groups considered and it
31
32 seems that a guaranteed level of acquired immunity through natural infection has been
33
34 reached although these data need to be integrated with other serological studies
35
36 assessing immunitary status in other younger age groups and completed with MMR
37
38 vaccination coverage of 95% with the first dose in all Italian regions.
39
40
41
42
43

44
45 The susceptibility rates for rubella obtained in our results are far from the value
46
47 obtained in national surveys in similar age groups (8%) and even farther from the target
48
49 of 5% set by the National Plan for Measles and Congenital Rubella Elimination
50
51 launched in 2003 (Giambi et al.2008; Presidency of the Council of Ministers 2003).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Suboptimal seroprevalence rates without gender difference, especially for rubella,
2
3 highlight the failure of previous selective rubella vaccination policy targeted at pre-
4
5 adolescent girls that had been recommended in Italy since 1972 (Osborne et al. 2000).
6
7

8 As a consequence of the suboptimal vaccination coverage, a high proportion of subjects
9
10 remain susceptible to rubella virus and a recent survey suggested that the late increase
11
12 of MMR vaccination coverage in childhood has not had an impact on seroprevalence in
13
14 childbearing age women. In fact, it is believed that over 5% of them are still susceptible
15
16 to rubella infection (Rota et al. 2007). Vaccination is one of the most effective measures
17
18 in the prevention of congenital rubella syndrome (CRS) (WHO 2005) but despite its
19
20 documented benefits our sample show that there are still childbearing women who are
21
22 not being adequately immunized. In fact, only a small proportion of females reported
23
24 having received rubella vaccination, mainly those aged under 24. From a public health
25
26 perspective, this leads to a very inadequate coverage (highest proportion susceptible for
27
28 rubella). The susceptibility value among our students neither prevents the circulation of
29
30 the virus nor the risk of CRS (WHO 2003; Presidency of the Council of Ministers
31
32 2003; WHO 2005).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Nowadays, interventions targeting childbearing age women are not yet satisfactory and,
41
42 although rubella vaccine is free of charge and preconceptional screening is available,
43
44 these opportunities are substantially missed reflecting that this offer is prevalently based
45
46 on providing immunization through vaccination services though the active support of
47
48 public health services and widespread awareness campaigns targeted towards this group
49
50 are lacking.
51
52
53

54 Surveillance data in fact, , show that less than 25% of women with suspected rubella
55
56 during pregnancy had undergone rubeo-test before pregnancy, even if it is offered free
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 charge by the Italian National Health Service before and during pregnancy (Giambi et
2 al.2008).

3
4
5
6 The present study has some interesting strengths and limitations. Concerning the
7
8 strengths, the results from the regression analysis revealed that factors such as
9
10 geographical residence (for MMR), age and vaccination (for measles and mumps) are
11
12 significantly associated to seroprevalence of these three infections. Moreover, our study
13
14 demonstrated that students have low levels of knowledge concerning measles, mumps
15
16 and rubella and were not practicing preventive behaviours that reduce their level of risk
17
18 (e.g. MMR vaccination). These findings have important implications for school health
19
20 and suggest that education programmes should be considered and implemented.
21
22

23
24
25 However, the results of this study need to be interpreted with caution, since several
26
27 limitations are recognised. First of all, it only involved students participating on
28
29 voluntary basis, therefore results might not be generalized to other student populations.
30
31 Replication studies need to be conducted at universities of different sizes and in
32
33 different geographical areas. A possible selection bias could have occurred concerning
34
35 gender, since the prevalence of participants were women. Likewise, higher responses
36
37 were obtained in the Faculties where female students were the majority. However, we
38
39 have to consider that the over represented number of females in our sample could bias
40
41 the results. Given that infections occur with equal frequency in men and women, as well
42
43 as the immunological response, and that gender appeared to have an influence only for
44
45 measles, it remains unclear whether females have a better serological response to the
46
47 measles vaccine than men (Dominguez et al 2006; Gdalevich et al. 2002). As such, the
48
49 selection bias in this study is likely to be limited. Moreover our situation presents a low
50
51 percentage of subjects vaccinated for measles. On the other hand, the preponderance of
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 women allowed us to better investigate rubella susceptibility, which is of great
2 importance for the women considering the teratogenic effects which may occur from
3 infection during pregnancy.
4
5
6

7
8 Concerning the study design, we must consider that vaccination status is self-reported,
9 and a possible recall bias could have occurred since almost all students involved did not
10 supply vaccination certificate and thus results could have been distorted. However, this
11 possibility may not influence the study in a systematic way since the clinical signs of
12 these infectious diseases are the most useful indicator of the presence of the diseases
13 themselves. The likelihood of recognising the diseases, even by non health personnel,
14 and subsequent related recall is very high.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 This study shows that sampled young adults can be exposed to an increasing risk of
26 MMR infection related to the history of vaccination campaigns and outbreaks in the
27 area where they lived their childhood. Concerted efforts are necessary to educate young
28 adults about the benefits of MMR vaccination particularly for rubella. Co-operation is
29 required not only between national and regional levels but especially at a Local Health
30 Unit level and should be enhanced in order to increase immunity rates for rubella in
31 childbearing women.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Conclusions**

46 Public Health Local authorities should promote, in their action plan against MMR,
47 much more incisive educational programmes in order to encourage young adults to have
48 MMR vaccinations and achieve a MMR vaccination recovery. This method is the only
49 way to increase the seroprevalence rate needed to interrupt transmission of MMR and
50 could be easily and quickly reached. Special attention should be paid to the recovery of
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 rubella susceptible females in these age cohorts in order to reduce the risk of CRS in
2
3 non- immune pregnant women. In this context, an added value could be represented by
4
5 the process of formal Health Technology Assessment of these vaccinations, with the
6
7 aim of considering not only the epidemiological, clinical and economic impact of the
8
9 vaccinations, but also the legal, social and bioethical aspects related to the vaccinations
10
11 themselves (La Torre et al. 2007). Finally, the need to establish collaborations is urgent
12
13 in order to train and create of an operational network among professional staff in the
14
15 health care area (e.g. general practitioners, gynaecologists and obstetricians) that could
16
17 help women to increase their knowledge of their immune status and encourage the use
18
19 of rubeo-test and rubella vaccination.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **Acknowledgements**

33
34 We are grateful to all the students who cooperated in this survey.
35
36

37 **Ethical approval**

38
39 All procedures were approved by the appropriate academic committees.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **Conflict of interest**

52
53 The authors declared that they have no conflict of interests.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 **References**
6
7

- 8
9
- 10 ▪ Andrews N, Tischer A, Siedler A, Pebody RG, Barbara C, Cotter S et al
11 (2008) Towards elimination: measles susceptibility in Australia and 17
12 European countries. Bull World Health Organ 86 (3): 197-204 Available at:
13 <http://www.who.int/bulletin/volumes/86/3/07-041129/en/index.html>.
14
15
16 Accessed 10 January 2009
 - 17
18 ▪ Baer G, Bonhoeffer J, Shaad UB, Heininger U (2005) Seroprevalence and
19 immunization history of selected vaccine preventable diseases in medical
20 students. Vaccine 23: 2016-2020
 - 21
22 ▪ Banatvala JE, Brown DWG (2004) Rubella. Lancet 363:1127-1137
 - 23
24 ▪ Bonanni P, Bechini A, Boccalini S, Peruzzi M, Tiscione E, Boncompagni G,
25 Mannelli F, Salmaso S, Filia A, Ciofi degli Atti M (2007) Progress in Italy
26 in control and elimination of measles and congenital rubella. Vaccine 25:
27 3105-10.
 - 28
29 ▪ Bonanni P, Bergamini M (2002) Factors influencing vaccine uptake in Italy.
30 Vaccine 20:S8-S12. Available at: <http://www.elsevier.com>. Accessed 18
31 March 2008
 - 32
33 ▪ Ciofi degli Atti M, Ferro A, Franco E, Grilli G, Guarino A, Iannazzo S,
34 Pavan A, Pizzuti R, Pompa MG e il Gruppo interregionale malattie infettive
35 e vaccinazioni. Stato di avanzamento del Piano Nazionale di eliminazione
36 del morbillo e della rosolia congenita (Update of the National Plan of
37 elimination of measles and congenital rubella) (2006) Not Ist Super Sanità
- 38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 19(4): 1-2. Available at: <http://www.iss.it/binary/publ/cont/0394->
2
3 [9303_2006_I_19_04.1148904381.pdf](http://www.iss.it/binary/publ/cont/0394-9303_2006_I_19_04.1148904381.pdf). Accessed 30 January 2009
4

- 5
6 ■ D.M. 7 aprile 1999: Nuovo calendario delle vaccinazioni obbligatorie e
7 raccomandate per l'età evolutiva. (Ministerial Decree 7 April 1999: New
8 mandatory and recommended vaccinations calendar for infants). Available
9 at: <http://www.epicentro.iss.it/temi/vaccinazioni/pdf/Decreto7aprile99.pdf>.
10 Accessed 18 January 2009
11
- 12 ■ Dominguez A, Plans P, Costa J, Torner N, Caldenosa N, Batalla J, Plasencia
13 A, Sallers L (2006) Seroprevalence of measles, rubella, and mumps
14 antibodies in Catalonia, Spain: results of a cross-sectional study. Eur J Clin
15 Microbiol Infect Dis 25: 310-317
16
- 17 ■ Donaghy M, Cameron JC, Friederichs V (2006) Increasing incidence of
18 mumps in Scotland: Options for reducing transmission. J Clin Virol 35: 121-
19 129
20
- 21 ■ EUVAC.NET (2007) Measles surveillance annual report 2006. Available at:
22 http://www.euvac.net/graphics/euvac/pdf/annual_2006.pdf. Accessed 30
23 December 2008
24
- 25 ■ Filia A, De Crescenzo M, Seyler T, Bella A, Ciofi Degli Atti ML, Nicoletti
26 L, Magurano F, Salmaso S (2008) Measles resurges in Italy: Preliminary
27 data from September 2007 to May 2008. Euro Surveill 13 (29): pii=18928.
28 Available at:
29 <http://www.eurosurveillance.org/ViewArticle.aspx?ArticleId=18928>. Accessed
30 30 January 2009
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
- Gabutti G, Guido M, Rota MC, De Donno A, Ciofi degli Atti ML, Crovari P (2008) The epidemiology of mumps in Italy. *Vaccine* 26: 2906-2911
 - Gdalevich M, Guy R, Mimouni D, Grotto I, Shpilberg O, Ashkenazi I (2002) Measles antibody prevalence rates among young adults in Israel. *Am J Infect Control* 30(3):165-169
 - Giambi C, Filia A, Ciofi degli Atti ML, Rota MC e Salmaso S (2008) Allarme rosolia: promuovere interventi per vaccinare le donne in età fertile. *Not Ist Super Sanità* 21 (5): i-ii (Rubella alarm: promoting intervention for vaccinating childbearing women). Available at: <http://www.iss.it/binary/publ/cont/maggio%20ONLINE%20DEF.1213182815.pdf>. Accessed 30 January 2009
 - Giambi C, Rota MC, Bella A, Filia A, Gabutti G, Guido M, De Donno A, Ciofi Degli Atti ML (2007) Epidemiologia della rosolia in Italia negli anni 1998-2004. (Rubella epidemiology in Italy, 1998-2004) *Ann Ig* 19(2): 93-102
 - Grandolfo ME, Medda E, Novello F, Ridolfi B and the Study Group (1998) Serological evaluation of 1989-91 mass vaccination campaigns against measles, in Italy. *Epidemiol Infect* 121: 645-652
 - Hamilton-West K (2006) Factors influencing MMR vaccination decision following a mumps outbreak on a university campus. *Vaccine* 24: 5183-91
 - <http://www.eurosurveillance.orgViewArticle.aspx?ArticleId=2994>. Accessed 10 July 2008
 - <http://www.ministerosalute.it/malattieInfettive>

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60
- 61
- 62
- 63
- 64
- 65
- Kancherla VS, Hanson C. Mumps resurgence in the United States (2006) *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 118(4): 938-941
 - Khare MM (2005) Infection disease in pregnancy. *Curr Obstet Gynaecol* 15: 149-156
 - Langiano E, Lanni L, Atrei P, Ferrara M, Di Staso A, De Vito E (2005) Vaccination coverage of 1995-2000 birth cohorts in the Italian province of Frosinone. *J Prev Med Hyg* 46 (3): 103-7
 - Langiano E, Lanni L, Ferrara M, Atrei P, Martellucci G, De Vito E (2007) Preventable infectious diseases using vaccination in developmental age in the Province of Frosinone, Italy. *J Prev Med Hyg* 48: 97-102
 - Langiano E, Ferrara M, Lanni L, Atrei P, Martellucci G, De Vito E (2009) Rubella seroprevalence in childbearing age women: a cross sectional study in the province of Frosinone, central Southern Italy. *Ital J Public Health* 3: 194-201
 - La Torre G, Chiaradia G, de Waure C, Mannocci A, Capri S, Bruno S, Cicchetti A, Bucci R, Bamfi F, Patarnello F, Marocco A, Ricciardi W, and HTA Collaborative Group (2007) Health technology assessment and vaccine: new needs and opportunities? *Ital J Public Health* 4(1): 81-88
 - Ministero della Salute Coperture vaccinali anno 2006 (Ministry of Health Vaccination coverages year 2006). Available at: http://www.ministerosalute.it/imgs/C_17pagineAree_811_listaFile_itemName_0_file.pdf. Accessed 30 December 2008
 - Ministero della Sanità. Circolare n. 12 del 13 luglio 1999. Controllo ed eliminazione del morbillo, rosolia e parotite, attraverso la vaccinazione.

1 (Ministry of Health. Circular n. 12, 13 July 1999. Control and elimination of
2 measles, rubella and mumps through vaccination). Available at:
3
4
5
6 http://www.ccm.ministerosalute.it/imgs/C_17_normativa_86_allegato.doc .

7
8 Accessed 30 December 2008

- 9
- 10 ■ Murray DL, Linch MA (1988) Determination of immune status to measles,
11 rubella, and varicella zoster viruses among medical students: assessment of
12 historical information. *Am J Public Health* 78(8): 836-838
 - 13
14
15
16
17
18 ■ Nardone A, Pebody RG, van den Hof S, Levy-Bruhl D, Plesner AM, Rota
19 MC, Tischer A, Andrews N, Berbers G, Crovari P, Edmunds WJ, Gabutti G,
20 Saliou P, Miller E (2003) Sero-epidemiology of mumps in western Europe.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
 - Ouhalal S (2000) Viral diseases in pregnancy: a review of rubella,
chickenpox, measles, mumps and 5th disease. *Primary care update. Ob/Gyns*
7: 31-34 Available at: <http://www.sciencedirect.com>. Accessed 18 January
2009
 - Presidenza del Consiglio dei Ministri. Repertorio Atti n. 1857 del 13
novembre 2003. Piano nazionale per l'eliminazione del morbillo e della
rosolia congenita. (Presidency of the Council of Ministers. Index of deeds n.
1873 November 13th 2003. National Plan eliminating measles and
congenital rubella.) Available at:

1 <http://www.governo.it/backoffice/allegati/20894-1712.pdf>. Accessed march
2
3 18th 2008
4

- 5
- 6 ■ Ramsay M (1999) A strategic framework for the elimination of measles in
7 the European Region. Copenhagen, WHO Regional Office for Europe
8 (document EUR/ICP/CMD5 01 01 05)
9
 - 10 ■ Rota MC, Bella A, Gabutti G, Giambi C, Filia A, Guido M, De Donno A,
11 Crovari P, Ciofi Degli Atti ML, Serological Study Group (2007) Rubella
12 seroprofile of the Italian population: an 8-year comparison. *Epidemiol*
13 *Infect*135(4):555-562
14
 - 15 ■ Sartorius B, Penttinen P, Nilsson J, Johansen K, Jönsson K, Arneborn M,
16 Löfdahl M, Giesecke J (2005) An outbreak of mumps in Sweden, February-
17 April 2004. *Euro Surveill* 10(9):pii=559. Available online at:
18 <http://www.eurosurveillance.org>. Accessed 10 July 2008
19
 - 20 ■ Schmidt D, Pichler AM, Wallenko H, Holzmann H, Popow-Kraupp T,
21 Allerberger F. Mumps outbreak affecting adolescent and young adults in
22 Austria (2006) *Euro Surveill* 11(27):pii=2994. Available online at:
23
 - 24 ■ Trevisan A, Morandin M, Frasson C, Paruzzolo P, Davanzo E, Di Marco L,
25 Fabrello A, Borella-Venturi M (2005) Prevalence of childhood exanthematic
26 disease antibodies in paramedical students: Need of vaccination. *Vaccine*
27 24: 171-6
28
 - 29 ■ Vandermeulen C, Roelants M, Roels GR, Van Damme P, Hoppenbrouwers
30 K (2007) Long-term persistence of antibodies after one or two doses of
31 MMR-vaccine. *Vaccine* 25: 6672-6676
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1 ▪ World Health Organization (2003) Strategic plan for measles and congenital
2 rubella infection in the European Region of WHO. Available at:
3
4 <http://www.euro.who.int/document/e81567.pdf> . Accessed 30 December
5
6 2008
7
8
9
10 ▪ World Health Organization (2005) Eliminating measles and rubella and
11 preventing congenital rubella infection. WHO European Region strategic
12 plan 2005-2010 Available from:
13 <http://www.euro.who.int/document/E87772.pdf>. Accessed 18 January 2009
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 ▪ World Health Organization (2005). Eliminating measles and rubella and
21 preventing congenital rubella infection. WHO European Region strategic
22 plan 2005-2010. Available at:
23 <http://www.euro.who.int/document/E87772.pdf>. Accessed 18 March 2008
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Reviewer #1: Manuscript Number: JOPH-D-09-00054

Dear Author,

the submitted article ("Are measles, mumps and rubella a Public Health issue in young adults? Results from a seroprevalence survey in university students in Italy") needs some major changes before it can be resubmitted.

Proof-reading of the article by a native English speaker is strongly recommended. It'll enhance the understanding of several parts made by the authors.

Materials Methods

The study design is not precisely described, for example:

- The description of the study population is not precise: Exclusion / Inclusion criteria are missing. Is it a representative sample? Are the students included in the survey from one or different study programmes?

Answer: We did not use criteria of exclusion, since the main object of the search, the criterion of inclusion was being university students, the population target of our study.

- The questionnaire should be described in more detail

Answer: following the suggestion of the reviewer we added more details.

(The first section of the questionnaire concerned socio-demographic data as age, gender, marital status, family structure and parental educational level and occupation. The second section regarded information about previous history of MMR diseases and previous history of MMR immunization. The third section evaluated the students' knowledge about the following topics: definition of MMR, transmission pathway of the infection, risk during pregnancy, risk in adulthood, MMR vaccine and precautions after vaccination).

- The information on the vaccination status through self-reporting is rather invalid. It is not described by the authors if the official certification of the vaccination status was a prerequisite for the study participation.

Answer: We added "Certification of the vaccination status was not a prerequisite for the study participation" at the end of the paragraph *Sampling and the questionnaire*.

- It is unclear whether all students of the university were asked to participate. For this study design it is a prerequisite to sign an informed consent. It remains unclear in the manuscript.

Answer: thanks to the reviewer suggestions, we added more details.

(All students attending the university were invited to participate in the survey. Informed consent for taking blood specimens and the use of personal data was obtained from all students who participated in the survey, with data being collected using a specific form.)

- A description of the serological test used for this survey should include more information (e.g. validated test system or not, manufacturer, detailed cut-off values etc.)

Answer: It was using a commercial ELISA immunoenzymatic test (Radim) according to the manufacturer's instructions. we added more details in the paragraph *serological assay*.

(The concentration of human IgG antibodies for mumps, measles and rubella was determined using a commercial ELISA immunoenzymatic test (Radim) according to the manufacturer's instructions. Enzyme immunoassay method was used for the qualitative determination of anti IgG antibodies for measles and mumps. The calculation of results obtained by qualitative assay, considered the optical density of each negative, positive and cut-off control. For qualitative IgG detection, the cut off recommended by the producer was used (OD>0.110): samples with optical density lower than the cut-off control were considered non reactive (negatives), samples with optical density higher than the cut-off control were considered reactive (positives), whilst samples with absorbance values ranging within $\pm 10\%$ of the cut-off control were considered questionable and repeated for confirmation.)

Results

The results should be described more precisely.

- The authors should describe why the study population consists mainly out of women (86,8%)?

Answer: we introduced in the discussion section a clearer statement about that

- The tables are not self-explanatory, description of p-values is not clear enough.

Answer: we introduced in the tables p values in a more detailed way. Moreover, in table 3 p values were not reported, since we wanted to avoid replications, after presenting the 95%CI of the OR.

- The description of seroprevalence data is of limited value without information on the official and certified vaccination status of the subjects. It remains unclear how many positive tests are a result of vaccination or natural infection.

Answer: The main aim of our study was to assess the level of susceptibility for Measles, Mumps and Rubella in a sample of university students. As described in "results" only 111 students said to be vaccinated against measles, 46 against mumps and 103 against rubella, and since only a negligible percentage of them (<1%) documented previous immunizations with the certificate issued from the Local Health Unit or the paediatrician, we preferred postponing the analysis of other variables to further detailed study. However, vaccination history resulted confirmed by serologic test in 97.3% of cases for measles, 93.5% for mumps and 90.3 % for rubella and disease history among positive and negative test MMR was reported in tab.2

Discussion

- Should be more structured and also shortened

Answer: the discussion was hopefully better structured and also shortened according to the comments of the reviewer.

- Methodological limits of the study design, like recall- and selection bias, should be described in more detail. Are there any strengths of the study?

Answer: strengths and limitations of the study are presented in more detailed way

- The consequences of the study concluded by the authors are not comprehensible, as it is not obvious whether the seroprevalence rate needed to interrupt transmission of MMR is due to wild type infections or MMR vaccination.

Answer: a statement on this suggestion made by the reviewer was added in the Conclusion paragraph.

Reviewer #2: The aim of the study was to assess seroprevalence against measles, mumps and rubella among Italian students and to find out whether seropositivity had been obtained from natural infection or vaccination and to assess the students' knowledge on these the infections in and outside pregnancy.

The survey yields a number of interesting findings:

1. Almost all students had antibodies against mumps and measles whereas some 20 % of the students were still susceptible for rubella.
2. Most of the students have converted to seropositive from infection rather from vaccination.
3. The students' knowledge about the risks of measles, mumps and rubella with respect to pregnancy and else wise was appallingly poor.

I have some suggestions to approve the paper:

1. Please describe the recruitment procedure in more detail: The participation rate of 7.4 % was extremely low. Were really all students invited to participate in this investigation or only those in the first year? Potential sources of bias need to be discussed!

Answer: All students attending the Faculties of Literature and Philosophy, Economics, Law, Engineering, Sport Science and the degree course of Nursing Sciences were invited to participate in the survey. Students attending the first year were informed directly in the classroom while others were informed through an invitation form sent by the secretary's office. Informed consent for taking blood specimens and the use of personal data was obtained from all students who participated in the survey, with data being collected using a specific form. A more detailed discussion on possible source of bias has been added.

2. The table two is very difficult to understand. "Do not" probably means do not know; please correct the rows for diseases history among positive or negative test for MMR for measles, mumps and rubella. These do not evidently add up of to 100 % but should for each headline "disease history among positive for MMR" as well as among "disease history" among negative for MMR.

Answer: we corrected table 2 according to reviewer's suggestions

3. I did not find table three with the modelling very helpful. I would rather suggest to leave out this table and to present the information on the students' knowledge about measles, mumps and rubella complications in table three instead.

Answer: we did not remove table 3, since we are convinced that the results demonstrated the influence of possible determinants of seropositivity for MMR, taking into account the control of potential confounding factors. Moreover, as suggested by the reviewer, we add information concerning students' knowledge about MMR.

Table 1- Positive seroprevalence IgG antibodies of Measles, Mumps and Rubella (MMR) stratified by gender, age group and residence

Personal data	Number tested	Measles		<i>p</i> - value	Mumps		<i>p</i> - value	Rubella		<i>p</i> - value
		n	%		n	%		n	%	
Age group										
18-20	271	254	93.7	0.02	251	92.6	0.7	208	76.7	0.04
21-25	432	395	91.4		389	90.0		351	81.2	
26-30	208	202	97.1		193	92.7		176	84.6	
≥31	47	42	89.4		43	91.4		44	93.6	
total	958	893	93.2		876	91.4		779	81.3	
Sex										
Male	127	117	92.1	0.90	111	87.4	0.1	107	84.2	0.30
Female	834	778	93.2		768	92.0		675	81.0	
total	961	895	93.1		879	91.4		782	81.3	
Residence										
Frosinone	752	707	94.0	0.06	695	92.4	0.04	609	80.1	0.20
Caserta	107	95	88.8		91	85		81	75.7	
Latina	45	42	93.3		43	95.5		43	95.5	
total	904	844	93.4		829	91.7		733	81.0	

Table 2- Disease history among the positive and negative test MMR

	Measles	Mumps	Rubella
<i>Diseases History</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>
Yes	607 (63.2)	273 (28.5)	275 (28.6)
No	152 (15.8)	259 (27)	232 (24.1)
Do not know	202 (21.0)	426 (44.5)	454 (47.3)
<i>Diseases History among positive test MMR</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>
Yes	586 (65.4)	267 (30.3)	242 (31)
No	121 (13.5)	221 (25.1)	176 (22.6)
Do not know	189 (21.1)	392 (44.6)	362 (46.4)
<i>Diseases History among negative test MMR</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>
Yes	19 (30.2)	6 (8.8)	30 (18.1)
No	30 (47.6)	36 (52.9)	51 (30.7)
Do not know	14 (22.2)	26 (38.3)	85 (51.2)
<i>p- value</i>	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.01

Table 3- Predictors and associated odds ratio of MMR seroprevalence rate.

<i>Characteristics</i>	<i>Measles</i>		<i>Mumps</i>		<i>Rubella</i>	
	<i>Crude OR (95% CI)</i>	<i>Adjusted OR (95% CI)</i>	<i>Crude OR (95% CI)</i>	<i>Adjusted OR (95% CI)</i>	<i>Crude OR (95% CI)</i>	<i>Adjusted OR (95% CI)</i>
Gender						
Male (reference)	1.0		1.0		1.0	
Female	1.11 (0.53-2.31)		1.80 (0.97-3.35)		0.83 (0.49-1.40)	
Age group						
< 26 (reference)	1.0	1.0	1.0		1.0	1.0
≥ 26	1.95 (0.98-3.90)	2.04 (1.02-4.10)	1.19 (0.67-2.12)		1.72 (1.13-2.62)	1.74 (1.14-2.65)
Marital status						
Not married (reference)	1.0		1.0		1.0	
Married	3.57 (0.86-14.83)		0.71 (0.34-1.48)		1.53 (0.82-2.88)	
Having given birth						
Yes	na		0.73 (0.28-1.91)		1.75 (0.73-4.15)	
No (reference)			1.0		1.0	
Vaccination						
Yes	2.74 (0.84-8.89)	2.96 (1.00- 9.67)	1.10 (0.33-3.64)		2.34 (1.16-4.74)	2.39(1.18 – 4.86)
No (reference)	1.0	1.0	1.0		1.0	1.0
Region						
Lazio	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	
Other region	0.49 (0.28-0.87)	0.51 (0.28-0.90)	0.51 (0.29-0.88)	0.51 (0.29-0.89)	0.84 (0.53-1.23)	

na= not applicable