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Reviewer’s report:

Abstract:
1. Methods for qualitative study (Sentences 3 and 4 in Results section) should be described in Methods, not in results. (Compulsory)

2. The abstract is heavy on methods description perhaps at the expense of highlighting results just a little more. Is it possible to bring any main points from the conclusion section to this and reduce the methods description eg, the focus of questions in qual interviews? (Discretionary but more people will read the paper if this is done)

Main paper

3. The background on local government is now much better and sets the scene well for international readers. One thing worth noting that is unique to Victoria is that immunisation is provided primarily via local government and hence has a relatively more prominent role in immunisation service delivery. While this fact is not integral to describing the setting, the authors may wish to consider whether it is relevant to the findings at all. (Discretionary)

4. What are “ethics documents”? Does this refer to the consent form? If so, this should be made clear. (Compulsory)

5. The qualitative analysis description is now more comprehensive and satisfactory. Does the following sentence mean that these emerging issues shaped the subsequent interviews? If so, this should be clearer. (Discretionary but useful)

   “Emerging issues were considered and noted during data collection, which also helped to shape and strengthen interviews as they progressed”

6. Having asked about methodology in my original review, I feel that the overall qual analysis process is sufficiently described to not require a defense of not using any one particular methodology. Therefore, suggest sentence on page 11 just state:

   “Knowledge translation perspectives and theory guided the overall study, data collection and analyses.” (Discretionary)

7. Authors need to ensure that all KT mentions are removed and replaced with
knowledge translation, except in relation to KT4LG. (compulsory)

8. In this study, what does “Public Health Managers” refer to? Are they internal or external to LG in Vic? (compulsory)

9. The Limitations section mentions the commonalities identified in responses but then in next sentence, the variation within local government. This should be clarified or better expressed. (compulsory)

10. Page 9 space missing before All
Page 11 (O and L reference 2006) ???
Compulsory
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