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Andrea Bucceri PhD
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Object: Response to the reviewer’s recommendations regarding our paper entitled: “Measles outbreak in displaced populations: A Review of Transmission, Morbidity and Mortality Associated Factors”

Dear Andrea Bucceri

Thank you for this opportunity you’re giving us to revise and improve once more the quality of the article entitled: “Epidemiological review of the risk factors of measles outbreaks in displaced populations.”

We revised the manuscript according to the recommendations of the reviewer as well as additional improvements and English proof-reading by a commercial copyediting service (See in blue color in the manuscript).

In yellow color highlights are the responses of the reviewer in this revised document.

We hope these improvements meet your approval. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
Kouadio koffi Isidore

OSHITANI

Hitoshi

pp.
Response to the recommendations of the reviewer

• **Major comments**

Although the authors have addressed some of the points raised by the reviewers, this manuscript still requires additional work before publication.

1. Key aspects of measles control in displaced settings remain either absent or hidden in the manuscript.
   Response: Further informations related to measles control in displaced population were clarified; See line 327 to 346.

2) It is my understanding that this manuscript is meant as a review of publications Concerning measles outbreaks in displaced settings. As a result, the background and discussion should be focused solely in these areas. For example, it is unclear why the authors have sentences on regional elimination.
   Response: The paragraph related to the regional elimination of measles was dilated from the revised manuscript as recommended by the reviewer.

3) The paragraphs on the Measles Initiative in the discussion are perhaps more suitable to explain the great strides in control at a global level, while in certain areas of the world, measles remains endemic. What is interesting about this review is not actually the findings, but the fact that the response to these situations have remained generally constant over the time period reviewed.
   Response: additional revision was made to meet the reviewer’s recommendation. See Line 322 to 326.

4) I also find that the authors are potentially confusing several issues. For example, I believe that authors may have misinterpreted my previous comment on malnutrition. My comment referred to the definition of malnutrition in the outbreaks reviewed. Was this using NCHS? Moderate? Severe? Global? For example, later in the manuscript (line 195) the authors report that malnutrition was described in 8 of the 11 articles. If malnutrition is discussed as a potential risk factor, that it is important for the reader to understand what is meant by this.
   Response: Further clarification was made, see line 97-98; line 193 to 196. We hope that this revised version respond to the reviewer’s recommendation.
5) I’m also not convinced that this is indeed a review of risk factors, but rather a review of the outbreaks themselves. Although this is an improved version, the manuscript still requires extensive editing for consistency in terminology, spelling and comprehension.
Response: The article was further revised, editing for consistency was done with use a commercial copyediting service. We hope that this version will meet the requirement of the reviewer.

- Minor comments:

1) As mentioned previously, MMWR is listed in PubMed, so this does not need to be mentioned separately.
Response: Correction was made accordingly to the reviewer’s recommendations. See Line 33-34, lines 156 and line 350 of the revised manuscript.

2) The search terms, especially using complex emergencies, could certainly have lead to articles being missed. It would be nice if the authors revised this section to account for the fact that they considered 2009 (as requested by another reviewer) and also searched simply under the term emergency as well.
Response: The literature search in our study was performed from October 2007- March 2008. The latest measles outbreak in displaced populations in our review took place in 2005, but the article itself was published in September 2006. Also search using Complex emergency was performed but no additional published scientific paper was matching with our selection criteria. We think that they was not enough published articles on the topic due to the fact that many organizations involved in managing measles outbreaks among displaced populations do not set a high priority on publishing their observations in addition to the significant drop in measles deaths due to the measles control effort set-up my the measles Initiative Program (MI). Our limitation may have been to have limited our study to only Published articles, further more on articles with QUANTITATIVE DATA and in English language only (not to include reports from the Grey literature and others). This was discussed in the limitation.

3) I am not sure what the evolution in incidence over time (starting line 229) actually means.
Response: The sentence regarding the evolution of the incidence overtime was dilated in the revised manuscript.