

Review of: "Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practice (KAP) Study for Reducing Invalid Vaccine Doses in Routine Immunization: A Cross-Sectional Study in Urban Slums of Bangladesh"

L Elit¹

¹ McMaster University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper of the KAP for reducing invalid vaccine doses in routine immunization. The authors have recruited a large sample size, 456 respondents.

Suggestions:

1. Abstract: The term "invalid vaccine doses" was not defined in the abstract. It needs to be defined within the first couple of sentences so the reader tracks with the authors.
2. Introduction: The term "invalid vaccine doses" is not defined until paragraph 3. I would suggest that it needs to be defined earlier in the introduction.
3. Introduction: A number of studies are listed with a number of findings. The introduction could be more focused if you discussed primarily the invalid vaccine dose issue and use a table to describe all the other factors.
4. Methods: Why were certain slums selected? Was this a paper questionnaire or computerized questionnaire or one on one verbal questionnaire? Why did you use the technique you used? Did you survey both moms and service providers in which case were these two groups compared and contrasted as the dataset is presented for the whole group and not separately.
5. Including a copy of the survey would be important
6. Analysis: Were the slums compared and contrasted to determine if a strategy is working well in one place and not another?
7. Results: childhood vaccines are supposed to be free in the EPI program. Why is cost a factor in Table 3?
8. Discussion. Need to explain Business competition regarding service charge on page 10.
9. Discussion: Figure 1 is not really helpful.
10. Discussion would benefit from being less wordy. For example, could remove "As per the first objective" of paragraph 1, or "another important thing" of conclusion
11. Whose responsibility is valid vaccine doses? I would argue that the responsibility lies with the health care provider to educate, recall and appropriately administer vaccine. Thus this manuscript is not a failure of the parent (mother) but rather the vaccine process. Understanding the knowledge of health care providers and their conduct in educating and documenting for parents and the recall process would be important to understand upfront.

