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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

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”, it is not clear how many health care workers worked in the two hospitals, 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.
   The last paragraph, the relation of such variables with anxiety must be more largely discussed.
Moreover, in this section, the authors must state the main limitations of this study.

In the conclusions, I would like to read something else on how the efficiency of media should be used to provide information on vaccine safety.

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 Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?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

9. Is the writing acceptable?
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.

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

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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