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Author’s response to reviews:

Responses to the Reviewers’ Comments and the Corresponding Revisions

We appreciate all the two reviewers for their careful evaluation of the manuscript. A thorough and detailed reply to each point raised by the reviewers together with the changes made to the manuscript is listed below.

We thank the editor for the suggestion, the format have been revised in the main text.

Response to Reviewer 1:

Comment: “line 18 in Abstract and again in Conclusions: the word "appear" is incorrect and should be deleted. Could I suggest a re-wording of this sentence? "Office buildings in crowded metropolis are prone to large-scale measles outbreaks, and require a rapid outbreak response.""

Response: We have corrected this sentence in p 2 line 18-19.

Comment: “Page 8 Line 19 and subsequently in the text and table 2: you use "surrounding commercial district". I think you mean "associated commercial centre". Surrounding commercial district suggests the commercial district around the building (surrounding blocks), for which you don't have the population.”
Response: We have corrected these sentences in p 9 line 1 and line 9.

Comment: “Page 9 Table 2: Stating relative risks of 1 against Other departments, Other companies and Commercial center is not correct, as I don’t think you have done any comparisons amongst these groups? It is more correct to indicate "-". Also, I think it would be neater if you put the signs (*, #, ^) against the RR rather than next to the variable.”

Response: We have corrected in Table 2 (p 9).

Comment: “Page 9, line 13, and also page 10 line 1: should be "for 21 days" not "after"”

Response: We have corrected in p 10 line 1 and line 3.

Comment: “Page 10, outbreak response: it would be preferable if precise dates could be given for the ORI e.g. "From March <date> the outbreak response immunization was implemented in Company A and exposed communities. From March <date> after cases had been found in other places...”"

Response: We have corrected these sentences in p 10 line 13-16.

Comment: “Page 10 line 17 - what is the non-ORI population in the office building? is this people who refused vaccination?”

Response: We have corrected these sentences in p 10 line 18-19.

Comment: “page 11 line 5 - "from " is repeated”

Response: We have corrected this sentence in p 11 line 6-7.

Comment: “Page 11, line 10: Please confirm that nucleotide sequencing of the virus was not undertaken, and if so, note that you are unable to confirm that all cases were sourced from the office building (albeit highly likely).”

Response: It has been discussed in the Discussion section in p 14 line 1-4.

Comment: “Page 12 line 19: isolation can't shorten the infectious period of measles, it reduces the transmission risk.”

Response: We have corrected the sentence in p 12 line 21.

Response to Reviewer 2:

Comment: “Despite that, the paper needs to a better description of laboratory methods. The authors didn't respond to comments related to molecular methods used to identify the genotype
H. Moreover, they don't provide sequences data and don't mention if sequences have been submitted in MeanS or GenBank database.”

Response: We thank the referee for the suggestion. The description of laboratory methods was added in page 5 line 9-14. As part of Chinese data in 2017, our sequences data has been published by the National Disease Control (PLoS One. 2019, 14(6): e0218782).