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Reviewer's report:

Revisions

Discretionary Revisions

Please reorganize the paper focus statement so that when you make references to immunizations in the world, third world, Africa, Nigeria it is still clear that your focus is Nigeria. The way it is now gets a little confusing to the reader. Some statements are confusing – “risk of full immunization” do you mean “likelihood” of full immunization?

Minor Essential Revisions

Please include a table that lists variables in the study, their definitions and summary statistics

Please re-organize the manuscript: Introduction that includes a short description of migration patterns in Nigeria to give the reader a proper context; background with statement of the problem and consequent research questions and hypotheses; Methods with Data sources; Theoretical framework with a description of variable selected for this study with and why they are considered to be appropriate.

Please state the study objectives more clearly.

Major Compulsory Revisions

Discretionary Revisions

Consider simplifying your analysis and including at most two analysis models. I am not sure that five models add information that you could not provide with only two models.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?

The question could have been better defined - i.e. a clearer statement of the problem, a clearer statement of the research question and researcher's
hypothesis

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
The methods are appropriate but not well described.

3. Are the data sound?
Yes – except – it is not clear how the variable representing wealth/income was extrapolated

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
A table of variables used in the study that includes definitions and summary statistics would be very useful and would make it easier for the reader to follow the methods description.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
No

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Not clear

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes

9. Is the writing acceptable?
There are several incomplete or complex sentences making reading a bit of a challenge.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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