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Reviewer’s report:

General comments

The authors presented the results of a small cross-sectional study on knowledge and attitudes related to A/H1N1 2009 vaccination among health care workers from two hospitals in Turkey.

The topic of the paper is interesting; however the paper per se suffers significant limitations and it should not be accepted in the present form. The authors should respond to major compulsory revisions and afterwards the paper would be re-evaluated.

Major Compulsory Revisions

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?)

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. Authors should keep references from media to a minimum level.
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