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Dear Roxane Rajabi,

Re: Knowledge, attitudes and anxiety, towards influenza A/H1N1 vaccination of healthcare workers in Gaziantep: a city in south-eastern Turkey (MS: 5522532703766655).

Here I submit the revised version of our manuscript entitled “Knowledge, attitudes and anxiety, towards influenza A/H1N1 vaccination of healthcare workers in Gaziantep: a city in south-eastern Turkey”

I have made revisions in accordance with the reviewers’ recommendations. I attached a detailed list of the changes made in response to the comments of the three reviewer. I believe, thanks to the reviewer’s considerate comments, the manuscript has been greatly improved. I hope that you will agree.

This study isn’t a experimental research on humans and on animals. Therefore, It wasn’t performed with the approval of ethics committee, only written permission was taken managers of the hospitals.

It would be a great honor and a pleasure for me to have a chance to dedicate my work to your journal again.

I would like to thank you once again for your careful review and close cooperation.

I am looking forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Derya TANRIVERDI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVIEWERS’ COMMENTS:</th>
<th>REPLY TO THE REVIEWERS’ COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer 1 (Jonathan A McCullers)</td>
<td>I would like to thank you for your careful review. Your comments are important for us for this article and our studies in the future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) The manuscript requires editing by an English language editor.

* It should be shortened. In particular, the following sections / sentences can be deleted entirely:
  - p.2, second paragraph, beginning Influenza A/H1N1

1) English Editing:
This paper was edited by Tina Thornton and Pınar Aksoy

Tina Thornton AE:
  Accredited Editor
  DipNsg, DipT (NsEd), BNsg, MEd,
  PostgradCertEditing
  Principal: Academic Editorial Services
  Website: www.academic-edit.com.au

Pınar Aksoy:
  Modern Languages Department
  Gaziantep University

The entire manuscript has been revised for language by a native speaker who has been working as an instructor of academic English at a major international university and editing and cross-translating medical manuscripts.

* It was shortened as:
  - P.2, second paragraph was deleted
  - P.2, last paragraph was deleted
  - P.3, first paragraph was deleted
  - P.3, second paragraph was shortened and arranged
  - p.4, first paragraph was shortened
  - p.4. Participant chapter was shortened
  - p.5, Statistical Analysis chapter was arranged
  - p.7, second paragraph was deleted and referred to in the Table 1,
  - p.7, third paragraph was arranged
  - P.8, second paragraph was deleted and referred to in the Table 3,
  - P.9, second paragraph was shortened and arranged
  - P.9, third paragraph was deleted
  - P.9, last paragraph was shortened and arranged
  - P.10, second paragraph was shortened
- p. 12, last 3 paragraphs of discussion immediately before the conclusions
- Table 1 can be deleted and referred to in the text, or the totals can be incorporated into a revised Table 2
- Table 2 should be revised so that the data are presented as 1 column for each group, Correct/Total (%) instead of 4 columns per group.
2) Table 5, the accompanying methods, results, and discussion should either be deleted entirely or significantly shortened and de-emphasized in the text
3) The authors should relate their findings to those of other in their region that are already published, particularly the Greek experience where media also played a role in negative stereotyping of the vaccine (Rachiotis G et al., Euro Surveill, 2010;15(6) and Mamas I et al., Acta Pediatr 2010;Feb 26).

The point that lack of support from government officials negatively impacted beliefs should be emphasized as this is a differentiating point from previously published studies of HCW attitudes towards vaccine.

**Minor Essential Revisions**
4) “Influenza A agent virus” should be “influenza A virus” throughout; please delete “agent”
5) p.3, line 14 – delete “countless”
6) p. 11, 2nd paragraph – the conclusions on anxiety levels in women relating to attitudes about the vaccine are overstated and should be deleted
7) Results and Tables 2 and 4 – low P-values should be presented as p < 0.001, not p = 0.000
8) Table 2, Is swine flu a serious outbreak – 86.8% not 6.8%
**Reviewer 2 (Christos Hadjichristodoulou)**

1. Introduction: The introduction needs shortening. In addition the authors should mention recent studies on the attitudes of health care workers towards A/H1N1 2009 vaccination. For example there is a Greek study (Rachiotis et al. Low acceptance of A (H1N1) 2009 vaccination among Health Care Workers in Greece. Eurosurveillance ; 2010,)and a German one: Wicker et al Influenza A/H1N1 2009 etc J Occup Med Toxicol 2010;5:10

2. Material and methods
   It is not clear to me the questionnaire used in this survey. The authors should present with details-the questionnaire in the material and methods section. Alternatively, the questionnaire could be included as an additional file.
   - Participants were asked if the vaccine was ‘reliable’. What does it means?
   - An additional major limitation is about sampling method. What is the sampling method used for this study. I suppose that the sample was convenient; however authors should clarify this issue.
   The limitations of the study should be discussed in the discussion section and not prior to results section.

3. Results
   The authors are advised to perform the statistical analysis of A/H1N1 2009 vaccination in a different way. At first the vaccination uptake could be analyzed (Univariate analysis) using a restricted number of variables e.g. by sex, age, duration of employment, educational level, occupation (doctors versus nursing and paramedic personnel), and vaccination against seasonal influenza (if there are available data).
   Afterwards logistic regression analysis should be performed.
   - The authors should present in details all side effects (%) reported by the participants and not only the pain in the vaccination site.
   Do authors have more detailed data on the sources of information about the safety of vaccines (apart from media; e.g.internet,hospital infection control committee etc?)

I would like to thank you for your careful review. Your comments are important for us for this article and our studies in the future.

1. The introduction was shortened. It was mention recent studies on the attitudes of health care workers towards A/H1N1 2009 vaccination.

2. All items of the questionnaire used in this survey were shown in Tables. Therefore, the questionnaire was not given as an additional file.

- Reliable was changed as safe. It means safe
- It was clarified (A structured, self-administered, anonymous questionnaire was distributed to a convenience sample of 300 HCW).
- The limitations of the study were discussed in the discussion section

3. we don’t have data about duration of employment, educational level, vaccination against seasonal influenza.

- All of the side effects (%) reported by the participants was added.

- we don’t have more detailed data on the sources of information about the safety of vaccines (apart from media; e.g.internet, hospital infection control committee etc?)
In table 3 authors have presented the results of multivariate analysis. I am not clear about the interpretation of the results. For instance what does it mean an OR: 3.5 for those health care workers reported that the disease is not serious? In the text authors have written that “participants who do not consider the disease as serious got vaccinated 3.5 fold less than ones considering the disease as serious”. However, table 3 led us to the opposite conclusion. I suggest that authors should reverse the reference category: people who reported ‘‘no’’ should be the reference category.

4. Discussion
The authors should provide with details the limitations of the study.

5. References
The references used should be valid.

- People who reported ‘‘no’’ was taken as the reference category.

- This table was revised.

4. The limitations of the study were discussed in the discussion section
5. Some valid references was added about media.

* This paper was edited by Tina Thornton and Pınar Aksoy
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?  
   In the title and after in the text, the authors must put off the word “anxiety” after the words “knowledge and attitudes” as developed in the manuscript.  
   In the background, last paragraph, the authors should briefly specify the variables made in relation with the anxiety levels.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?  
   Methods:  
   - paragraph “participants”, how many were asked to participate to the study and how many completed and returned the questionnaire  
   - paragraph “statistical analysis”, it should be briefly specified what are the 6 variables analyzed in logistic model.

3. Are the data sound?  
   Results:  
   - last paragraph, the data on the relation with anxiety are not well expressed  
   - text and tables should report the main outcomes of statistical analysis, as declared in the methods (chi-square, t-test), not only p-value. Where is the output of logistic regression?

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?  
   See above.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?  
   The discussion is too long. The authors should avoid to repeat the results and better discuss the main points emerged from their survey.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?  
   See above.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?  
   Yes.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References 3 (Rosa Prato)</th>
<th>I would like to thank you for your careful review Your comments are important for us for this article and our studies in the future.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It was arranged</td>
<td>2. The majority of participants in this study were willing to contribute to this study and only twenty HCW refused to participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paragraph “statistical analysis”, it was specified what are the 5 variables analyzed (Sex, thoughts about the seriousness of the outbreak, protectiveness of the vaccine, safety of the vaccine, whether respondents would allow their children to get vaccinated.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Table 1 and Table 2 was revised according to other reviewer’s comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Text and tables was reported the main outcomes of statistical analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5- The discussion was shortened and avoided to repeat the results and better discussed the main points emerged from our survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Your idea about anxiety is very important for us. We think as you, but after the statistical analysis was done, the significant variables are very limited. So that, only the significant variables the relation with anxiety was discussed. Another reviewer wanted us to delete related to anxiety section. However, According to your idea we didn’t delete this section. But I was not added anything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The limitations of the study were discussed in the discussion section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- In the conclusions, It was added something on how the efficiency of media should be used to provide information on vaccine safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See above.</td>
<td>9. Background, paragraph 4: It was revised the sentence “as of 22 November 2009 pandemic (H1N1) 2009”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Is the writing acceptable?</td>
<td>- Authors’ contribution was changed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background, paragraph 4: rewrite the sentence “as of 22 November 2009 pandemic (H1N1) 2009”. Authors’ contribution: what do you mean with sequence alignment? References: I have some difficulties to assess references in Turkish.</td>
<td>- The Turkish references was arranged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* This paper was edited by Tina Thornton and Pınar Aksoy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>