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Reviewer’s report:

This third draft of the manuscript describes in a more clear and comprehensive way the work undertaken by the authors to evaluate vaccination in one district of Pakistan’s Punjab province. The methods including the limitations, are clearer allowing the reader to better interpret and evaluate the work done. The English has also been much improved making reading easier.

Major compulsory revisions
None

Minor essential revisions
1. What are characteristics of immunization status? (pg 5) – status is either vaccinated or non-vaccinated? In the results it is the characteristics of families with vaccinated or unvaccinated children that are evaluated. Please clarify this.

2. In the methods there is no description of how the lots were ‘randomly selected’, please clarify (for example: were numbers allocated to each area and then numbers randomly selected using the random number function of Excel?)

3. Again in the methods – For LQAS there is no ‘accuracy level +/- 5’, if this is for weighted averages, please state this.

4. Page 7, Data collection, 2nd paragraph – A cross-sectional survey of vaccination coverage evaluates a prevalence and not a rate. Please remove the word rate and leave ‘Coverage was measured...’ This should also be corrected on page 8 in the second paragraph.

5. Page 7, Data collection – 3rd paragraph - The selection of the first household is well described, but the selection of subsequent households is not mentioned. Were houses chosen by proximity?

6. Page 7, Data collection – 3rd paragraph - How was the one child from each household selected? Was it the youngest child?

7. In the limitation section of the discussion, random walk can be used for many types of village design. I would either explain more fully or remove this sentence.

8. In the limitation section of the discussion the high error for NID coverage is not
due to high thresholds (which may be appropriate), but due to the low sample size chosen. A higher sample size would have reduced the error. This may have been logistically difficult and could be mentioned.

Discretionary revisions

1. The 7th line in paragraph 1 of the main text should probably read ‘raised questions about the feasibility’

2. It seems redundant to have both ‘although’ at the beginning of the sentence and ‘yet’ in the middle, one or the other would suffice

3. Data is a plural noun (singular datum) and therefore a plural verb should be used ‘data are required’, this should be corrected throughout.

4. In the recommendations – 2nd point, this point covers many subjects, the idea of redefining vaccination areas has not appeared elsewhere in the manuscript – the point would be stronger if linked more fully to the text or removed

2. In the recommendations – 2nd paragraph the comment about birth registration is a long term goal and should perhaps be made into a separate point

6. In the recommendations – 3rd point I would elaborate on this point to make it stronger – consideration of socioeconomic status – make it clear who should be prioritized

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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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