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Reviewer's report:

My previous comments have been adequately addressed except for:

1) Discussion, third paragraph. The authors state that “higher susceptibility …could reflect waning immunity “and that “these women remain at risk for rubella infection during pregnancy which may result in CRS”. Are the authors suggesting that there is a need for rescreening of women who were previously rubella seropositive? Could there be other factors besides waning immunity that can explain higher susceptibility levels in this population group? Although waning immunity is definitely a concern, the risk of CRS in children born to mothers who have seroreverted after receiving one dose of rubella-containing vaccine has not been established. The authors should better address the concept of waning immunity and its public health significance and give a reference to other work on the subject. (Minor essential revision)

2) Discussion, Paragraph 1, second sentence (“This is lower than the corresponding level…”) I recommend either deleting this statement or mentioning why this information is important. If the authors should choose to leave the sentence in, I would recommend not starting the next sentence with “However” but with “Also” since both statements are meant to highlight that susceptibility levels are low. (Discretionary revision)

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
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