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Reviewer’s report:

General
This is in general, a clearly written report on an emerging topic. There are some modifications which I believe would improve the paper.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Methods: Although this is a substudy of another, I would like some demographic information about the parents. This would help put the responses into a context.
Methods: Last para, 2nd sentence is confusing, as written. Do you mean, "The lowest quartile of mean scores was compared with the remaining quartiles for regression analyses?"
Methods: Why were these four states selected? Were the selected schools in Colorado and Massachusetts within the regions with the IRs?
Results: I would like to know which of these registries notifies parents about immunizations that are due for their children. This might have an impact on their views of IRs.
Discussion: There is very little comparison with any related previous work.
Discussion: It is unclear whether those who reported support of IRs received information on the survey about them, or whether only those aware of IRs were asked if they supported them.
Discussion: A limitation that is not mentioned is the fact that so few parents were aware of IRs.
Discussion: Why do you use a published citation for “anectodal information?”
Tables 2 and 3: These tables would be much more illuminating if Ns were included as well as %s.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Abstract: Methods, 1st sentence, suggest exempt from rather than exempt to.
Abstract: 2nd sentence of the conclusions should be in the Results section.
Background: page 6, Suggest reversing paragraphs 2 and 3 to be consistent with the format of the results.
Results: Would like a P value on the response rate.
Results: Para 3, Should be communities not community and Respondents not Respondent.
Discussion: para 2, Change finding to findings.
Discussion: Para 3, 4th sentence. Suggest a citation for statement regarding Health care providers, change impact (a noun) to affect (a verb).
Table 1 could be less wordy.
Tables 3 and 4: Suggest using the term "Number of Antigen Exceptions" instead of “number of antigens exempt for.”
Table 6 could be eliminated and put into text.
Tables 4 and 5 are not really improved by adding the total rows.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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

Statistical review: No