Summary

This paper describes results of a cross-sectional survey reporting on parental knowledge and attitudes regarding HPV vaccination in Brazil. The paper supports existing qualitative evidence of Brazilian parents in support of HPV vaccination. The study executes its purpose to describe parental attitudes and knowledge of the HPV vaccination. Given that Brazil expanded the program in 2017, this paper supports the existing policy to include males in the HPV vaccination program.

Title/Abstract

Pg. 1 Line 1: The study design term 'cross-sectional survey' should be in the title /abstract

Objectives

Page 5, lines 109-111: Wording of study objective / purpose is confusing a bit. How is the study a proxy measure of participation? Participation in what? The HPV vaccine program? You do not evaluate parental attitudes, you describe them. Revise wording to simply state the purpose of your study. "The purpose of the study was to describe parental attitudes regarding age- and gender-based HPV vaccination exclusions, as well as parental knowledge of HPV and the HPV vaccine. As you have in your discussion, you can discuss that your study informs policy, the right to participation, and demonstrate information accessibility, but it is not part of the study objective.

Methods

Pg 6 line 143 "between June and August 2015, 219 surveys were collected." Consider moving the relevant dates to page 5 pg 113. From June to August 2015, we conducted an interviewer administered cross-sectional survey with 219 participants to understand..."
pg 6. line 128 - specify what instruments measuring what? Instruments measuring attitudes about HPV? Vaccine efficacy?

Pg 7 line 168: Provide interquartile range for median income

Discussion:

Overall the discussion could use some tightening up, it is a bit long winded and without flow given the limited results of the study. Your discussion should focus on summarizing key results in relation to your objective. It could be more concise in relation to your key findings, namely, parental attitudes demonstrate support for the HPV vaccine outside of the currently eligibility, the cost of vaccination, and HIV knowledge supporting information accessibility. Discuss these key findings in relation to the current HPV policy, cost, coverage etc.

See other specific comments below.

Page 9 line 214-217: move limitations to the end of discussion

Pg 10 line 223: consistent - not 'constant'

Pg 10 - line 232: participation in? be specific. Studies such as ours may be used as an informal form of participation in decision making?

Pg 10 line 233-234: I'm not sure I agree with this statement, your study provides evidence to support policy decision-making and to inform policy. I think you can omit the line 223-224 about studies can be an informal form of participation. This is research and this wasn't community-based participatory research, it did allow parents to participate in a research process, but it was a structured questionnaire, and didn't really allow for voice or participation in the way that other methods would.

Pg 13 line 295-309: This discussion about Zika seems completely out of place. It doesn't really relate to your results and should be omitted. Your discussion should really focus on how your key results relate to what is known in the literature and the policy on the ground. Future research in relation to the topic is fine, but Zika vaccination is out of place.

Strengths and Limitations: You need to expand on the limitations of this study, cross-sectional study design etc. You mention social desirability bias pg 9 line 214-217. Strengths and limitations of a research study typically come at the end of a discussion section. What are the strengths of the study and what are its weaknesses or limitations given the study design or other factors in this context? These need to be included and discussed further.

What is the generalizability of these findings in Brazil? This study was done in one location in Brazil, is this generalizable to the whole country? Why or why not?
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Needs some language corrections before being published
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