

## Reviewer's report

**Title:** Private Provider Participation in Statewide Immunization Registries

**Version:** 2 **Date:** 31 January 2006

**Reviewer:** Kimberly Rask

### Reviewer's report:

General

The authors have responded to my previous comments and have clarified or revised the manuscript as indicated. I have no further comments prior to publication.

-----  
Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

none

-----  
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

none

-----  
Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

The reader would benefit from a more focused discussion about the implication of these findings for more widespread registry adoption. What should be the next steps?

**What next?:** Accept after discretionary revisions

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare that I have no competing interests.