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#School of Hygiene

Ministry of Health

P. O. Box 88, Tamale

Northern Region, Ghana

25th March, 2017

The Editor

Achieves of Public Health
Dear Sir/Madam,

REVISED MANUSCRIPT RESUBMISSION (AOPH-D-16-00104R2)

I am pleased to resubmit our revised manuscript "Evaluation of Immunization Coverage and its associated factors among children 12-23 months of age in Techiman Municipality, Ghana".

We are particularly grateful to both Editor and Reviewer. Your comments did not only help with the revision, but we also learned that categorical variables should not be analyzed as continuous in this particular case. This has been very helpful in terms of knowledge gained. Thus, it has greatly improved the quality of the manuscript. Below, we have provided responses to comments/suggestions.

We prepared and submitted one documents: revised manuscript with track changes.

In addition, we adequately addressed the comments in this version. We are happy to receive further comments or suggestions when necessary.

Kind regards

Signed

Benjamin Baguune

(Corresponding author)
Editor:

General comment from Editor:

Your manuscript "Evaluation of Immunization Coverage and its associated factors among children 12-23 months of age in Techiman Municipality, Ghana" (AOPH-D-16-00104R2) and your reply has been assessed by the Editor-in-Chief. 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:

We are very grateful for the positive and encouraging comments to improve our manuscript. We particularly thank the Reviewer for the detail and facilitative comments.

Reviewer:

Methods and Results:

Reviewer’s comment 1:

When the logistic regression is unadjusted, please do not label it as multivariate: you can refer it as the crude OR. Correct both in text and table and title.

Response:

The authors made the necessary changes. Please, see details on under results section, page 11, lines 191 to 195 and page 25, table 4. All logistic regression results using bivariate analysis now has “crude” before the OR (i.e. crude OR).
Reviewer’s comment 2:


=> change to “Determinants of immunization status in xxxxx, 2016. Results from a bivariate and multivariate logistic* regression”.

in the legend of the table* *: OR of being immunized

Response:

The authors have made the necessary changes as suggested. Please, see details under results section on page 12, lines 213 to 214 and page 25, lines 451 to 452. “Table 4: Determinants of immunization status in Techiman Municipality, Ghana. Results from a bivariate and multivariate logistic regression”

In addition, we have now added legend to table 4. Please, see page 25, line 454 “*: OR – Odds Ratio being immunized”

Reviewer’s comment 3:

Table 4 remains unclear. In what you bring under "multivariate (unadjusted)“, the OR cannot be interpreted when the variable is not binary. Take e.g. age; there is only one OR (0.43), while age has 5 categories and you would expect next to "reference 1.0) , 4 other OR , unless one has used age as a continuous variable. This could be for age, but not education or for ethnicity. Therefore it is proposed to use the determinants as dummy variable in all analysis
Response:

The above comment has helped the authors to improve the logistic regression analysis. We had wrongly analyzed the variables as continuous variables in the first part (bivariate). With the facilitative comment, the authors have reanalyzed both bivariate and multivariate logistic regressions as categorical variables except age of child which is continuous with values from 12 to 13 months.

Please see the detail changes -:

Abstract: page 2, lines 14, 17-22
Methods: page 8, line 138
Results: page 11, lines 188 –206
Table 4: page 25, lines 453 - 455

Reviewer’s comment 4:

In the text and in abstract, under results it is not clear when describing table 4 that the OR smaller than 1, means that the people under this category are less immunized

Response:

The authors have acknowledged the lack of clarity on describing table 4. In the dummy data, 0 “fully immunized” and 1 “not fully immunized”. In view of the above comment, we have revised the description. If OR is smaller than 1, it is now described as “protective against child immunization status” while OR greater than 1, is now described as a “risk factor for child immunization status”.
Abstract: page 2, lines 23-25

Results: page 12, lines 210-211

Discussion: Page 14, lines 268-272, page 15, lines 284 and 296, page 16, line 303, 312-315

Thank you.

Benjamin Baguune

(Corresponding author)