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Author's response to reviews

The Editorial Team:

RE: MS: 1071507553719442
A bibliometric analysis of childhood immunisation research productivity in Africa since the onset of the Expanded Programme on Immunisation in 1974

Thank you for the opportunity to revise and resubmit our manuscript.

We have now provided a point-by-point response to comments from the statistical advisor

Sincerely, for Authors
Charles Wiysonge
A. STATISTICS ADVISOR’S COMMENTS

The authors now described the model selection criterion was actually "Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC)" rather than "Bayesian Deviance Information Criterion (DIC)". BIC and DIC are not the same thing. The authors may want to further provide some brief description on model diagnosis and goodness-of-fit in the text before a fitted model can be compared to other competing models.

**Reply:** Thanks for confirming this. We have now discussed the model diagnosis and goodness-of-fit (most especially for Poisson) in the appendix 1.

# 1d - Thank you for the clarification on the figure. Table 2 also indicates that the minimum count is one in the last column of the table. And zero-truncated negative binomial models are designed for data without zero values on the dependent count variable.

**Reply:** Thanks

# 2 Old comment: Is there a similar figure to compare two models with multiple covariates corresponding to Test 2? I am not sure why graphs of predicted count are subjective? It should be helpful to present such a graph to show how the model-based fitted values are close to the observed data, at least in the supplements. The graph may not be a formal statistical testing, but it can be an informal checking and illustrative. It can illustrate whether the model is fitted well. BIC is a summary measure by a single number, which should not replace or exclude the graph.

**Reply:** As suggested, we now included the graphical comparisons of the models in the appendix 1, both for intercept only and with covariates adjusted models.

# 4 - Old comment: Correlation analyses were mentioned twice in the Statistical Analysis section. But correlations seemed not reported in the Results section. Please clarify? Initially, what? is the motivation to do correlation analyses and were there any interesting findings? Why did the authors finally decide not to report the results? Because the analyses results were not important/relevant or they might raise some possible issues for author? s interpretation of results? For example, in Table 5, any explanation or comments on why the most significant factor in univariable analysis (i.e., Research and development expenditure) became non-significant in multivariable analysis? Although the change in significance is not unusual between univariable and multivariable analysis.

**Reply:** We have now reported the correlation analyses.

The end. Thanks