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COVER LETTER AND RESPONSES TO REVIEWERS:

Dear Sir,

Please find enclosed the revised manuscript “Parental knowledge of paediatric vaccination.” for possible publication in your journal.
Thank you for your comments. Below please find enclosed a detailed answer to the points raised by the reviewers.

Responses to the Reviewers

1- Associate Editor

1. In Table 1, correct answers are presented for the knowledge and attitude scale. Firstly, is there no scientific controversy about the correct answer? If yes, please address in the Discussion. Secondly, also related to the validity of the scale, to what extent does the scale measure attitudes? It really is only knowledge, not attitude? Please re-consider the label for the scale or otherwise address the issue.

The reviewer is correct. We have re-examined the translation of the questions and have altered slightly two questions. In addition, we now state “Most-correct answer” instead of correct answer in order to show that there is room for discussion on this subject.
The title of table 1 has been changed to “Knowledge about vaccination”. The title of table 5 has also been changed.

2. The authors did not sufficiently address my previous comment on Table 3. What exactly is in there? Not much is described in the Results on this table. What is its purpose? This should be further described. As previously commented, I thought, it would perhaps be more interesting to see percentages of coverage according to the correct or wrong answers. Could the correct answer (although mentioned in table 1) be typed in bold in Table 3 (with a footnote telling that bold stands for the correct answer)?

We have changed Table 3 to include the percentages of coverage according to the right or wrong answers. We have also marked the correct answers in italics and added a footnote, as suggested by the reviewer.

3. It should be made more explicit that maternal age was only available for about half the sample and why?

Due to an error in the initial questionnaire design, maternal age was recorded in only 310 mothers. We tried to retrieve this information but it was possible only in some cases.
4. In a response to one of the reviewers, it was responded that control for "main maternal occupation - household tasks" did not affect coverage. I think it would be useful to put this in the manuscript too, when discussing the maternal age effect.

We now state on page 6 “Neither was an observation observed between the mother’s occupational status and vaccination coverage. For the 4:4:4:3:1 schedule, coverage in working mothers was 87.32% compared with 84.73% in non-working mothers (OR:1.24; 95% CI: 0.77-2.01), and for the 3:3:3:3:1 schedule the respective values were 95% and 93.10 %. (OR: 1.44; 95% CI: 0.71-2.92).” and in the Discussion on page 8 “Whether the mother worked or not had no effect on vaccination coverage. “

Minor comments

1. remove one dot, where there are two dots on page 2 and 10.
   This has been done.

2. page 5 and page 6 report different numbers for the total sample (630 versus 627). The latter number when computing the percentage that sent the vaccination card. Please correct.
   We now state “The vaccination card was sent for study by 46.88% (294/627) of parents (in three cases the parents stated they had no vaccine card as they were opposed to vaccines) and the information coincided in 100% of cases. “

3. Page 7: "....(Table 4)." should be ".....(Table 3)."
   This has been corrected.

4. Page 7: 89% should be 90%.
   We now state “Vaccines were perceived as necessary by 89% of parents interviewed”

In addition,

1. Please state the name of the ethics committee, which granted you permission to perform this investigation, in the Methods section of the manuscript.
   This has been included. We now state “The study was approved by the Bioethics Committee of the Department of Health, Generalitat of Catalonia. “ (page 5)

2. Please include a specific "Conclusions" section. This should follow your "Discussion".
   This has been done.

2- Patricia Blank:
Results: The label (Table 4) in the sentence "Table 3 shows (...)" should be (Table 3). This has been corrected.

All Authors have seen and approved the manuscript and have contributed significantly to the work. On behalf of all the authors, I state that the manuscript has not been published and is not being considered for publication elsewhere.

With best regards,

Eva Borràs López
Barcelona, 17 February 2008
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