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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions

1. Methods:
   It is reported that „Vaccination information was also collected from these mother-infant pairs, and 128 additional infants were included in the analyses.‟ However, according to FigureS1, these 128 infants are already included in the number of 1148 mother-infant pairs which were previously cited.

2. Proportion of study participants remaining in the study after each visit (and/or proportion of participants lost to follow-up) should be stated in addition to the numbers in Figure S1.

3. Results:
   Presentation of results is not fully transparent and conclusive:
   Although results for all the vaccines together were announced, table 1, figure 1 and 2 do not include information on measles vaccination coverage.

4. Information on overall vaccination coverage (all recommended vaccines) as stated in paragraph 2 of ‘results’ is not presented in table 1 and figures 1 and 2. The stated information should be retrievable from table 1.

5. It should be added ‘data not shown’ at the end of paragraph three (information on site stratified analyses of SES).

6. Discussion
   In the paragraph on study limitations, a proportion of 13% of participants, who were not interviewed at the 24 weeks visit, is mentioned. However, calculation of the proportion of participants lost to follow-up on the basis of the numbers in
Figure S1 leads to a proportion of 17% (87+461+410=958 remaining participants out of 1148 which were included in the study). Proportion of participants without interview (n=15+27+33=75; denominator: all participants at 24 week-visit = 958) is 8%. Therefore, the basis for this “13%” is not clear. Adding the information on the proportion (of lost to follow ups) to the numbers in Figure S1 (as proposed in the comment above) might clarify the question. Numbers should be consistently presented prior to publication.
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