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Reviewer's report:

Overall a great study - with important observational information about vaccine effectiveness. Very minor comments:

In the Abstract first sentence, you mention "exposed" individuals - I think "vaccinated" would be a better term throughout the paper.

The methods sentences "on a 64-bit based PC with dual core Intel® (Santa Clara, CA, USA) Xeon® CPU x5680 at 3.33 GHz, 6 cores, and 12 logical processors, with 44.0 GB of RAM, and utilizing Microsoft (Redmond, WA, USA) Windows 7 Ultimate operating system was used to examine the IHRD." seem unnecessary to me.

Some material from methods could be moved to results, for instance "Overall, it was observed that 76 persons were diagnosed with measles in the unexposed cohort. In the MMR vaccine exposed cohort, a total of 55 persons were diagnosed with measles, but only 12 were diagnosed with measles post-MMR vaccine administration"

In the methods - how did you control for the variable "date of birth"? Was it entered as a continuous variable or did you categorize it?

Do you know how many cases were reported to the national notifiable disease system from Florida in this time period (compared to what you found in the Medicaid system)? It seems there might be some sort of selection bias -although I don't think it would have a huge impact on your estimates.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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