

## 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

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

### VERSION 1 - REVIEW

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

<b>THE STUDY</b>	No patients in this study
<b>RESULTS &amp; CONCLUSIONS</b>	There is missing information which is not consistent in the different tables

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Peter Davies, Consultant Chest Physician, Liverpool Heart and Chest Hospital, L14 3PE  No competing interests
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	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.

