

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/resources/checklist.pdf>) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

TITLE (PROVISIONAL)	Sociodemographic and psychological determinants of influenza vaccine intention amongst recipients of autologous and allogeneic haematopoietic stem cell transplant: a cross-sectional survey of UK transplant recipients using a modified health belief model.
AUTHORS	Miller, Paul; Forster, Alice; de Silva, Thushan; Leonard, Hayley; Anthias, Chloe; Mayhew, Michaela; Klammer, Matthias; Paskar, Susan; Hurst, Erin; Peggs, Karl; Madrigal, Alejandro; Snowden, John

VERSION 1 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Silvio Tafuri University of Bari Aldo Moro, Bari, Italy
REVIEW RETURNED	18-Jan-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	<p>Dear editor, thank you very much for the opportunity of reviewing this manuscript. Authors have to consider the need of some revision before the publication</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Key words must be different than title words2. In the introduction, authors have to explain the UK framework for the vaccination of HSCT recipients3. in the introduction, some data about flu immunization coverage in the HSCT recipients must be useful4. line 198: please check if the right statistical test carried out is "paired sample T-test" (I think that unpaired sample T-test could be right)5. line 200-202: when you describe the model, you have to clarify the outcome and the determinants6. line 223: AML. Please explain7. table 2 must be re-formulated. You have to describe the percentage referred to each value in the two groups8. please, don't repeat data reported in table in the text9. in the discussion, you have to discuss the major weakness of your study: the low number of enrolled patients with low intention for SIIV10. implications of your results for public health authorities must be discussed in the conclusion11. ref 21: please check for consistency
-------------------------	--

REVIEWER	Claudio Costantino Department of Science for Health Promotion and Mother to Child Care "G. D'Alessandro" - University of Palermo
REVIEW RETURNED	22-Jan-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	Dear Authors,
-------------------------	---------------

	<p>the work is well written, the objective is well defined, the results are clearly presented and the conclusion justified the data presented. Please add in Introduction or in the discussion section (e.g. lines 419 - 422) some references regarding the effectiveness of influenza vaccination in subjects with comorbidity and in particular in HSCT recipients (for instance: Restivo V, Costantino C, Bono S, Maniglia M, Marchese V, Ventura G, Casuccio A, Tramuto F, Vitale F. Influenza vaccine effectiveness among high-risk groups: A systematic literature review and meta-analysis of case-control and cohort studies. Hum Vaccin Immunother. 2017 May 8;1-12. doi: 10.1080/21645515.2017.1321722.).</p> <p>Best Regards</p>
--	---

VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Silvio Tafuri

Institution and Country: University of Bari Aldo Moro, Bari, Italy

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below Dear editor, thank you very much for the opportunity of reviewing this manuscript.

Authors have to consider the need of some revision before the publication

1. Key words must be different than title words

2. In the introduction, authors have to explain the UK framework for the vaccination of HSCT recipients

Detail added at Line 99 and Line 102-106

3. in the introduction, some data about flu immunization coverage in the HSCT recipients must be useful

See line 101-102. Detail added at line 102-106

4. line 198: please check if the right statistical test carried out is "paired sample T-test" (I think that unpaired sample T-test could be right)

For this particular analysis, recipients' responses were compared within high and low intent groups, rather than between high and low intent groups. As the analysis was comparing responses from the same group of patients, a paired T Test was used.

5. line 200-202: when you describe the model, you have to clarify the outcome and the determinants
Line 206-207 : phrasing changed to clarify this point

6. line 223: AML. Please explain

Line 230 definition added

7. table 2 must be re-formulated. You have to describe the percentage referred to each value in the two groups

I'm not I have understood this comment. The table describes the characteristics of n=93 participants. Within each group the percentage of patients expressing high intent is given. I have also added the n

value for each % value which I think is what the reviewer is asking. Please let me know if I have misinterpreted.

8. please, don't repeat data reported in table in the text
Repeated data deleted from text

9. in the discussion, you have to discuss the major weakness of your study: the low number of enrolled patients with low intention for SIIV
Added to strengths and weaknesses and discussed at line 352-354

10. implications of your results for public health authorities must be discussed in the conclusion
Detail added at lines 442-445 and 454

11. ref 21: please check for consistency
Updated

Reviewer: 2
Reviewer Name: Claudio Costantino

Institution and Country: Department of Science for Health Promotion and Mother to Child Care "G. D'Alessandro" - University of Palermo

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': None declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below Dear Authors, the work is well written, the objective is well defined, the results are clearly presented and the conclusion justified the data presented.

Please add in Introduction or in the discussion section (e.g. lines 419 - 422) some references regarding the effectiveness of influenza vaccination in subjects with comorbidity and in particular in HSCT recipients (for instance: Restivo V, Costantino C, Bono S, Maniglia M, Marchese V, Ventura G, Casuccio A, Tramuto F, Vitale F. Influenza vaccine effectiveness among high-risk groups: A systematic literature review and meta-analysis of case-control and cohort studies. Hum Vaccin Immunother. 2017 May 8;1-12. doi: 10.1080/21645515.2017.1321722.).

Detail added line 102-107 as per reviewer 1's comments

VERSION 2 – REVIEW

REVIEWER	Silvio Tafuri University of Bari Aldo Moro
REVIEW RETURNED	25-Mar-2018

GENERAL COMMENTS	Dear Editor, the paper is well written and clear and I think that it is acceptable for publication after few minor revisions: -abstract, line 58 (patients aged over 65.... have low intent): please, check for consistency, I think that, according to the results, there is a mistake in the abstract -strength of the study, line 76: please, delete "To our knowledge"
-------------------------	---

	-introduction: please, discuss more in depth the risk of GVHD related to vaccination and seasonal flu -methods and results: educational background must be reported as number of age of study -discussion: this section lacks of some sentence about S&W. Please, check the expression "GP surgery" for consistency -reference: please, check references for consistency. Some references lack of the DOI
--	--

VERSION 2 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:

Reviewer: 1

Reviewer Name: Silvio Tafuri

Institution and Country: University of Bari Aldo Moro

Please state any competing interests or state 'None declared': Nonde declared

Please leave your comments for the authors below Dear Editor, the paper is well written and clear and I think that it is acceptable for publication after few minor revisions:

-abstract, line 58 (patients aged over 65.... have low intent): please, check for consistency, I think that, according to the results, there is a mistake in the abstract

RESPONSE

The odds ratio given is of high intent. I appreciate that the phrasing of the sentence makes this unclear and the quoted OR therefore looks incorrect. Rephrased for clarity.

-strenght of the study, line 76: please, delete "To our knowledge"

RESPONSE

Already deleted as per editor's comments above

-introduction: please, discuss more in depth the risk of GVHD related to vaccination and seasonal flu

RESPONSE

Additional detail added at line 105-111 and 114-115

-methods and results: educational background must be reported as number of age of study

RESPONSE

Given the number of participants in each age group is small I'm not sure this subdivision of educational background will be useful or offer additional insight. Particularly as we found no association between educational background and intent.

-discussion: this section lacks of some sentence about S&W. Please, check the expression "GP surgery" for consistency

RESPONSE

Content removed from opening paragraph of discussion (391-399), expanded and a strengths and weaknesses section added lines 481-493

Limitation added at 97-98

GP surgery used consistently throughout

-reference: please, check references for consistency. Some references lack of the DOI

DOI / URL added where available