

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Paediatrics Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

This paper was submitted to a another journal from BMJ but declined for publication following peer review. The authors addressed the reviewers' comments and submitted the revised paper to BMJ Paediatrics Open. The paper was subsequently accepted for publication at BMJ Paediatrics Open.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Exploring pneumonia risk factors in Vietnamese infants – a survey of new mothers
AUTHORS	Nguyen, Thi Kim Phuong; Tran, Hoang; Foster, Kirsty; Roberts, Christine; Marais, Ben

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Turner, Paul Cambodia Oxford Medical Research Unit Competing interests: I have no competing interests to declare.
REVIEW RETURNED	21-May-2017

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>This is a well written manuscript describing the limited possibilities for modifying pneumonia risk factors in children born in Da Nang, Vietnam.</p> <p>The methodology seems sound but the number of women interviewed was quite low. Unfortunately, figure 2 was not available for review. I am just not sure that the findings are of sufficient interest to a general paediatric readership.</p> <p>There are a few minor issues to be fixed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Abstract / methods: the study period is "10/02/2017 to 14/02/2017" in the abstract but "10/02/2017 - 24/02/2017" elsewhere. - Background (P2, L21): should be "Haemophilus influenzae" rather than "Haemophilus influenza" - Methods (P5, L37): please give a citation/reference for "Epidata". - Results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - P6, L11: "The majority of mothers (55.2%) were primigravidas". Might be fairer to say "around half". - P6, L49: can the authors provide the numerator and denominator for 19.6% (mothers who intended to obtain PCV)? - Discussion: "Cesearean" should be corrected throughout.
-------------------------	--

Permission to publish reviewer 2's review was not received.

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewers' comments

1. Abstract / methods: the study period is "10/02/2017 to 14/02/2017" in the abstract but "10/02/2017 - 24/02/2017" elsewhere.

**Please accept our apologies for this mistake. The study was performed over a 2-week period (from 10/02/2017 to 24/02/2017) and we ensured consistency between the abstract and methods section.

2. Background (P2, L21): should be "Haemophilus influenzae" rather than "Haemophilus influenza"

**Thank you for pointing this out – corrected

3. Methods (P5, L37): please give a citation/reference for "Epidata".

**A reference for "Epidata" was included in the text and reference section

4. Results:

- P6, L11: "The majority of mothers (55.2%) were primigravidas". Might be fairer to say "around half".

**The text was adjusted to read: "Around a half of mothers (55.2%) were primigravidas"

- P6, L49: can the authors provide the numerator and denominator for 19.6% (mothers who intended to obtain PCV)?

**We included the relevant numerator and denominator to read: "Only 64/286 (22.4%) mothers were aware of the pneumococcal conjugate vaccine and 56/286 (19.6%) intended to provide this to their infant".

5. Discussion: "Cesearean" should be corrected throughout.

**Corrected