

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form ([see an example](#)) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below. Some articles will have been accepted based in part or entirely on reviews undertaken for other BMJ Group journals. These will be reproduced where possible.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	BCG vaccination in England since 2005: a survey of policy and practice in England
AUTHORS	Pilger, Daniel ; Nguipdop-Djomo, Patrick; Abubakar, Ibrahim; Elliman, David; Rodrigues, Laura; Watson, John; Eastman, Vera; Mangtani, Punam

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

REVIEWER	Delane Shingadia, Great Ormond Street Hospital I do not have any conflict of interests
REVIEW RETURNED	07-May-2012

THE STUDY	No patients in this study
RESULTS & CONCLUSIONS	There is missing information which is not consistent in the different tables

REVIEWER	Peter Davies, Consultant Chest Physician, Liverpool Heart and Chest Hospital, L14 3PE No competing interests
REVIEW RETURNED	29-May-2012

- The reviewer completed the checklist but made no further comments.

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer:

There is missing information which is not consistent in the different tables

RESPONSE: Although there are different numbers given for missing observations, the information is consistent. The different numbers in the tables result from different respondents failing to answer different items of the questionnaire. We have clarified the reasons for missing data in the legend of table 2.

