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This research has a contribution to the scientific knowledge of understanding childhood immunization defaulting which remains a challenge for the health sector in many developing countries, including Ethiopia, and the findings are important to similar research areas.

Comments

Abstract

- Line 31: Include unique inputs of your research or any local data that can amplify the significance of your study.

Introduction

- Line 65-68: What about the newly added vaccines (PCV, Rota vaccines)?
- Consider updated references and don't use reference of reference, rather use source references..
- Line 69: Check for errors in sentence writing.
- Line 74-75, 99-102: Still the authors are using old references.
- Line 103-106: Consider EDHS 2016 reports.

- Include specific local contexts concerning incomplete immunisation which driven the research to be undertaken in that specific district and the research gaps that your research intended to fill.

Methods

- Line 120: How did you selected the six rural kebeles thru random or purposive selection?

- Include a summary chart of your sampling techniques, otherwise, it is difficult for your readers to understand your sampling steps and how you applied the stratified multistage sampling technique? And also a summary table which illustrates the total number of cases and controls of each kebele from the census and in your final sample.

- Why you preferred the stratified multistage sampling technique and what is your basis to form the stratas; these issues should clearly be articulated in your paper.

- Why you favoured one to one case to control ratio, from view of precision in comparison?

- Line 130: Was your data collection tool developed by you own? Describe the content areas of your measuring tool?

- Line 139: Use bullets for each operational definition.

- Line 144-145: How did you resolved any discrepancies between maternal reports and immunisation records?

- Line 165: …bi-variable analysis…… replace with 'bi variate analysis'. Also check for other similar errors in the document.
Results

- Line 192: rewrite as…Mothers' health service related characteristics

- Line 211: mother's satisfaction of what?

- Table 3: Presenting COR is not necessary, instead better to include P-values to easily indicate significance level.

Discussion

- Line 221-226: It seems a background information rather than discussion part.

- Line 245-246: But 'Home visits by HEWs' was assessed in your study and was not a predictor of defaulting. So, how your justification can be explained, do you suspect any co-linearity or synergistic effect between variables?

Conclusion

- Make your recommendations specific to some responsible body.

- Avoid bullets in this section.

In addition to the above comments, as a general comment, extensive editing of the research article for grammatical errors and improper writing is needed.
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