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Reviewer's report:

In general the authors have answered my comments very well.
Some minor essential and discretionary revisions remain.

Minor essential revisions:

1. Introduction line 5:
"Although some women can acquire natural immunity .... asymptomatic" should be replaced by "Although some women may acquire natural immunity against rubella by infection in childhood, which is often asymptomatic" as a subclinical infection is per definition asymptomatic.

2. Introduction line 14:
"to vaccinate all women of reproductive age group" should be replaced by "to vaccinate all women before they reach reproductive age".

3. Results line 6:
"None of them had reported .... by blood test" should be "None of them reported a past history of rubella infection, that was confirmed by clinical diagnosis of a physician or by blood test."

4. Conclusions
A last sentence should be added e.g. "However, as serology testing is more expensive than taking a vaccination history, a cost-utility analysis is recommended in case of resource constraint" in order to make the conclusion in the text compatible with the conclusion in the abstract.

Discretionary revisions:

5. Discussion, second paragraph, line 8.
The sentence "Davidkin.....17 years old [28]." could be left out to improve the readability.

6. Discussion, third paragraph
Consider rewriting this paragraph, as the connection between the sentences is not clear.
**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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