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Reviewer's report:

This is a clear paper showing the need for adapting measles elimination strategies in high income countries to respond to changes in population immunity profiles over time. Some remaining comments follow:

p.10 Lines 17-18: The sentence "In the model only individuals who have not received either the first or the second dose are considered eligible for the two latter immunisation strategies" is a little unclear - do you mean that only individuals who have not already received 2 doses of vaccine through the routine programme are eligible? That is, individuals who were either unvaccinated against measles or had only received one dose were eligible?

p.11 line 5: I think you mean replacement rather than replenishment of individuals who were immune as a consequence of natural infection with susceptible individuals who have been neither infected nor vaccinated.

p.11 line 50: "However, 100% coverage in both the 1st and the 2nd dose is expected to reduce the fraction of susceptible individuals in 2050 around 10%" - this is not very clear, do you mean to reduce the fraction susceptible by 10 percentage points, or to around 10% of the population?

p.12 It's still unclear to me whether the catch-up campaign targets children aged 1-15 years or only school children. Or, are 2 different types of campaigns being considered, one for children aged 1-15 years and a different one for schoolchildren at the time of introduction of the school entry laws?

p.13 The authors mention spatial heterogeneity in coverage but might wish to expand on this a little, with reference e.g. to the recent paper by Truelove et al (Vaccine. 2018 Dec 19. pii: S0264-410X(18)31672-4. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2018.12.012), to avoid giving the message that achieving an average level below 7.5% population susceptibility will always be enough to sustain elimination.

Fig 3 title: there seem to be some typos or words missing here.
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