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Reviewer's report:

Background and methods:

1) In the background section, reference is made on the national immunization coverage of 77% but no mention is made for the region where the study was conducted. This does not help contextualize the problem. This information should be added. Also, this percentage would have been a better estimate for sample size calculation.

2) Any particular reason why analysis was carried out using two statistical software packages?

3) Ethics: You indicated that the Techiman Municipal Health Directorate gave permission and participants gave informed consent. However there is indication of a competent ethical review committee having reviewed and approved the protocol.

Results:

1) Improve style of writing! For example on line 182- (Nearly all (97.0%) of the respondents possessed their children's' child health record cards 183 except the remaining 3.0% (Table 1)). It is obvious that the compliment of 97% is 3% so need to mention it.

2) Line 223 & 212: Factors associated with incomplete child immunization status using multivariate (unadjusted) 213 logistic regression analysis. If no control variables were included in the analysis then this can't be referred to as multivariate. Probably meant bivariate analysis.
3) Last column, table 2 the title should be Coverage by either card or recall NOT Coverage by card plus recall.

4) It is not clear whether the outcome variable was two are three categories (fully vaccinated, partially and not vaccinated at all). If three categories, binary logistic regression would not work. If the 6 cases that were not vaccinated at all were dropped or regrouped with partial this need to be said explicitly.

5) A huge odds ratio figure such as AOR=227.81 is a pointer to too small numbers in the cells. You might consider revisiting this- consider collapsing response categories.
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