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**Reviewer's report:**

Overall, it is a clearly written paper. Rationale and research questions are clearly presented in the introduction. Though, the novelty is in the study of pandemic vaccine, in my opinion the investigators do not add much to the vast current literature on determinants of influenza vaccine uptake and merely underscore the need for program improvements. Importantly, the investigators do not use existing implementation models to systematically assess all possible determinants that are relevant in the uptake. It might be possible that the investigators did study more relevant, than major revision is required to show this information.

Minor comment: Authors should be consistent with the name of influenza as in different parts of the text it is called A (H1N1) influenza, A influenza, influenza A or H1N1 influenza etc.

**Methods**

Some minor comments: Participants should be described more detailed in a “Participants” section, for example mentioning the number of participants, the response rate etc. there, afterwards omitting this information in “Study design” section or “Demographics”. In “Statistical analysis” the chosen level of significance could be mentioned.

Although the paper speaks about the willingness of accepting the vaccine, the “Study design” part is ended with mentioning “results on vaccine acceptability are reported in this paper”, which is not completely true.

**Results**

Minor comments: When reporting the results, the authors should decide whether to report the p values or the confidence intervals, the latter is preferable. Still, in case of reporting p values, it is recommended to choose whether to report exact p values or to choose a certain level of significance; unless there would be an argument for the choice to report both.

The reader should be referred to look at Table 2 in the text of a “Result” section (pg.8).

**Discussion**

Authors should give a reference in the first part of a second paragraph in the
discussion. Additionally, in this paper no variables indicating “fear of side effects or concern” or “efficacy of the new vaccine” were included (although this might be a good idea).

Authors should make it clear for the reader the evidence they mention and provide references at the very end of the discussion and the beginning of the conclusions.

Finally, how can we use this information to improve the vaccination programs? It might be worth spending some words on how the investigators think the determinants can be used to change behaviour.
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