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Reviewer's report:

This paper reports an original, important and well defined study which used appropriate methodology. It was clearly written up and was a pleasure to read. I have only one small minor revision:

1. In the first paragraph of the discussion which states that the overall proportion of parents vaccinated is higher than expected, the authors should mention the role selection bias may have played in this. The response rate was only 43% and parents who take the time to respond to the survey may well be more likely to have been vaccinated. The fifth paragraph mentions possible reasons for the low response rate, and says that this may have introduced bias, but this could be expanded upon, eg responders could be more likely to have heard of pertussis than non-responders. The results were adjusted to take into account the difference between population sizes of metropolitan versus rural LGAs, which is fine except that this could give the reader a false sense that these proportions have been adjusted so that they reflect the population, whereas the far greater error comes from the selection bias, which we have no idea about. Whilst there is nothing that can be done about this bias, its possible effects do need discussing.

If this minor revision is made, the paper should be accepted for publication. It is a highly polished paper and doesn’t require any editing.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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