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School of Hygiene
Ministry of Health
P. O. Box 88, Tamale
Northern Region, Ghana

12th October 2016

The Editor
Achieves of Public Health

Dear Sir/Madam,

RE-SUBMISSION OF A REVISED MANUSCRIPT (AOPH-D-16-00104)

I herein resubmit our revised manuscript on "Evaluation of Immunization Coverage and its associated factors among children 12-23 months of age in Techiman Municipal, Ghana".
We are particularly grateful to both the Editor and Reviewer. Your comments have been very helpful and it has greatly improved the quality of the manuscript. In addition, we have specifically addressed each of the comments/suggestions from the Reviewer in the revised manuscript.

General Comments from Editor:

Although, it is of interest, we are unable to consider it for publication in its current form. The reviewers have raised a number of points which we believe would improve the manuscript and may allow a revised version to be published in Archives of Public Health.

Response from Authors:

We have revised our manuscripts to conform to the journal style from the previous form. For example, line numbering has been included from abstract to the end of the manuscript.

In addition, the specific place where the tables are expected to be inserted has been indicated in the revised form (see details on page 10, line 185, 196 -197; page 11, lines 208-209, 223-224 and page 12, lines 250-251). Moreover, all the track changes are maintained for easy verification.

Comments from Reviewer:

Comment 1:

Although there are no difference in inference between the probit and logit model, I suggest you repeat your analysis using a logistic model (also multivariate), as the results are direct for interpretation as Odds Ratio.
Response from Authors:

We are grateful for this particular suggestion/comment. We have reanalyzed the data using multivariate logistic region (both adjusted and unadjusted). Thus, table 4 in the previous manuscript has been replaced with the revised information and tables. The following pages and lines contain the inserted information or deleted information.

Page 2, lines 19-26, results using multivariate logistic regression has been inserted.

Page 3, lines 28-33, previous probit analysis results have been deleted.

Page 8, lines 148-153, data analysis on logistic regression has been added.

Pages 8-9, lines 155-163, information on probit analysis has been deleted.

Pages 11-12, lines 212-248, description of tables 4 and 5 based on multivariate analysis has been inserted.

Pages 12-13, lines 255-266, description of tables 4 and 5 based on probit analysis has been deleted.

Pages 15-18, lines 316-379 on discussion based on the multivariate results has been inserted.

Pages 18-20, lines 381-437 on discussion based on probit analysis has been deleted.

Page 20, lines 449-450 on conclusion has been inserted based on the logistic regression.

Page 20, lines 450-451 on conclusion has been deleted based on probit analysis.
Page 28, lines 578-580 on table 4 as an additional file has been deleted.

Page 29, lines 581-583 on table 4 as an additional file has been inserted.

Page 30, lines 586-588 on table 5 as an additional file has been inserted.

Comment 2:
Title of tables should have reference to place and time and the study

Response from Authors:
Thank you for the additional comment. Now, we have added place and time of the study on all the tables. For specifics, see the following pages:

Page 10, lines 185 and 196-197 for tables 1 and 2 and

Pages 11, lines 208-209 and 223-224 on tables 3 and 4

Page 12, lines 250-251 on table 5

Page 26, line 566 for table 1

Page 27, line 570 for table 2
Comment 3:
Optional: did you not consider a multinomial analysis given vaccination status in more than binary?

Response from Authors:
We are very grateful for this helpful suggestion. With the inclusion of logistic regression analysis in the revised version of our manuscript and presented as tables 4 and 5, we are of the view that the multinomial analysis may not significantly make a difference. Thus, we did not provide new information on this comment.

With humility, we believe that all the comments have been adequately addressed in our revised manuscript.

Kind regards

Benjamin Baguune
(Corresponding author)