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Reviewer’s report:

The author revised the previous paper and responded my comments. The sensitivity and specificity of MicroImmune EIA kits were well described referring the paper. Regrettably, oral IgG ad IgM immune responses after vaccination were not examined in initially oral IgG positives.

I have a comment in revised version.

They concluded that these data indicate a need to revise immunization policy. Their conclusion seems to be overemphasized. The data demonstrated in the paper that the positive rate of oral IgG EIA at 9 months of age was higher than that at 6 months of age. It would be supposed to have contact with measles without any measles illness. Immune response was observed in 84.2% (IgG and or IgG antibodies) of the recipients aged 9 months. The authors should perform comparative vaccine study to evaluate the immune response after vaccination at 6 months or at 9 months, in order to recommend the revised immune schedule. Depending upon the vaccine strain, serological response was different when measles vaccine was administered at 6 months of age. The word “a need to revise” is strong and “a need to re-evaluate”, “ a need to perform further vaccine study”, or other mild expression would be better. There is no data supporting the last sentence in their experiments.