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Letter to the Editor:

Dear Alex Gibson,

1. We thank the reviewers for their contribution to the improvement of this manuscript. We have added our thanks to them in the Acknowledgments section.

2. The manuscript has been revised to respond to the following points:
   - **Background section too long**: We reduced this section to 910 words and the original text (2053 words) was placed in an appendix, as suggested by Reviewer 2. Thus, readers seeking more information will be able to find it there.
   - **Models that differ from each other in 1998 and 2003 because they do not have the same variables**: We have revised Table 2 and 1998 and 2003 include the same variables.
   - **Different number of districts in 1998 and 2003**: This is due to an administrative reform that increased their number (explanation provided on page 7).
   - **All minor corrections suggested** were made in the new manuscript: The abbreviations DTC and DTCoq were replaced by DTP (pp. 4, 9, 12). The age for the official definition of complete vaccination was specified on page 9. The CIs in Table 1 were standardized to two decimal points. On page 12, because we compared the proportions using the Chi-square test, we did not follow the suggestion of Reviewer 2 which was to present an RR with a CI. The terms “independent variables,” “bivariate” and “multivariate analyses” were replaced, respectively, by “explanatory variables” (pages 9), “univariate” (page 10 and title of Table 1) and “multivariable analyses” (title of Table 2).
   - **Explanation of “898 after weighting” and “1,461 after weighting”**: When DHS data is being analyzed, to ensure representativeness of the sample, a weighting is applied that takes into account the sampling method. This explanation is provided in the revised manuscript (page 7) with the relevant reference.
   - **Ethical approval**: This was provided by the Burkina Faso Ethics Committee, as now indicated on p. 8 in the paragraph entitled “source of data.”

3. **Discussion section too long**: We did not shorten this section as suggested by Reviewer 2 because, in fact, it contains the verbatim results of interviews with key informants which are essential in the interpretation of quantitative data. We did not discuss complete vaccination in terms of the child’s sex because in Burkina Faso the child’s sex is not associated with complete vaccination, as we showed in an earlier study (ref. 13) and confirmed in this one.

Best regards