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How French physicians manage with a future change in the primary vaccination of infants against diphtheria, tetanus, pertussis and poliomyelitis? A qualitative study with focus groups. R1

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I appreciated very much the changes the authors have made in keeping with my comments. I think that their manuscript is now improved, but I suggest still discretionary revisions for them for them.

The aims of their work were more clearly stated as contributing to maintain high coverage or to achieve higher coverage, by means of increasing both physicians’ and parents’ acceptance of changes in the vaccination schedule. I have only to point out a few imprecisions to be revised in the text: in the introduction, when the authors present their secondary objectives, I suggest substituting “needs” for “wishes” for implementations, as well as adding “in relation to parental acceptance of the annual changes in vaccination” when they define the second secondary objective (otherwise it would be too similar to the first aim of the research). Also, in the sentence in the last paragraph of the discussion, “preferences” should be replaced, in my opinion, by “demands”.

The methods used were better presented, allowing the reader to understand their potential and limits, though a few assertions seem rough such as when the authors maintain that “interviews completed the focus groups”. However, the authors do not provide a convincing explanation for choosing the focus group from among other qualitative methods (e.g. interviews), nor do they discuss what contribution their approach made to answering the research question, as compared to other and more traditional ones. The introduction of GL to the qualitative research methods [referred to by the authors] suggests that the researcher pose these questions first: is qualitative methodology the best approach, given the aims of the study? Has the study design described and justified why a particular method (e.g., interviews) was used from among:

• Textual analysis: documents, art, representations, conversations chosen
• Interviews: experience, perceptions, behaviour, practice, process
• Focus groups: group dynamics, convenience, non-sensitive topics
• Ethnography: culture, organizational behaviour, interaction.

Moreover, the authors do not discuss how reliable their conclusions are. Are they so confident that they have detected the most important reasons for the disagreement of both physicians and parents that they propose specific interventions, certain of removing important obstacles to attaining larger and faster immunisation coverage? I suggest that the authors, for example, report in the discussion what improvements the suggestions they make have contributed in other experiences.

I think that a more detailed synthesis in the conclusions might suffice to convince me and, more importantly, the health authorities. Thus I suggest that the authors delete the last two sentences of the conclusions (which are rather difficult to understand ) and provide specific details, i.e.

1) what are the most important problems that prevent physicians and parents from accepting immunisation changes;

2) what interventions should have priority in efficaciously implementing the new vaccination schedule (e.g. to reduce the missed opportunities reported by the physicians);

3) what kind of collaboration has this experience introduced with a view towards future recommendations (up to now, generic statements about the advisability/necessity of a broad agreement with health authorities has been the most highlighted).

If the authors comply with these recommendations, even I shall be convinced!
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