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Reviewer's report:

Major comments

Although the authors have addressed some of the points raised by the reviewers, this manuscript still requires additional work before publication. Key aspects of measles control in displaced settings remain either absent or hidden in the manuscript. 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. 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.

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. I am 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.

Minor comments:

1) As mentioned previously, MMWR is listed in PubMed, so this does not need to be mentioned separately.

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.

3) I am not sure what the evolution in incidence over time (starting line 229)
actually means.
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