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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. Abstract, Conclusions: “Further research is needed” – please make a suggestion about what this future research would aim to do. This statement alone is vague and the authors should have some ideas based on their research about where the problems lie, what factors future research might examine and what sort of study design might be needed (see comments related to this in other sections below). Many studies have shown poor HCW willingness to accept influenza vaccine – the authors need to try and take it to the next step.

2. To provide greater context for why this study was conducted, and what it will add to the current literature, please could the authors make a comment on whether any previous studies in Hong Kong have examined willingness of community-based nursing or medical staff to accept influenza vaccine. The authors only discuss two studies of their own related to hospital-based staff.

3. P7 Statistical analysis. Please explain how multiple logistic regressions analysis was conducted and on what basis variables were retained or rejected, and how the final model was determined. (eg backward, stepwise logistic regression, cut-off p values etc)

4. p10. Discussion, para 3. As for point 1, above. “The barriers to pandemic influenza vaccination should be identified by specifically designed studies”. Please elaborate – what design, what factors need to be further explored. Etc etc.

5. p10-11 Discussion. The Discussion in general needs more critical interpretation, not just repetition of the results. There is not a lot of direction to future researchers about what the key elements of future studies might look at, what possible solutions there might be etc etc. Mostly contains statements of what they and others already have found.

6. p11. Strengths and weaknesses of the study. First sentence: I do not agree that “our results provide timely information for policy makers to consider measures to improve vaccination uptake in this group”. This is certainly not a strength of the study. The authors did not examine factors for improving uptake, nor do they comment on these. They make comments about “future research” being needed.
7. Strengths and weaknesses. Can the authors please explain how recall bias might affect their results?

Minor Essential Revisions

1. P4, participants: brackets in the wrong place. Should be: “The rest of CNS nurses (around 100 of them) provide psychiatric services in the community”

2. P5, Study design, para 2. there is an asterix after CNS centres – sentence 1. It is unclear what this refers to

3. To better understand the survey response rate, please indicate how follow-up was conducted with the 12 CNS centres in order to encourage completion of questionnaires (for example, number of reminders and how they were given, over what time period etc).

4. P6 Survey Design, Para 1. It would be helpful to have a statement that the full questionnaire can be accessed by contacting the authors – or having an appendix or table with an abbreviated version of the questionnaire +/- key questions covered.

5. P7 Results, Demographics. Table 1 should be first referred to in the first two paragraphs.


Discretionary Revisions

1. Suggest “decline vaccine” rather than “refuse vaccine” throughout this manuscript since interviewees are being asked whether they would theoretically accept a vaccine or not.

2. Suggest removing decimal points for reporting percentages.

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**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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