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Dear Editor,

Biomed Infectious Diseases

RE: MS: 8892720833159585
Awareness, Attitudes, and Practices Related to the Swine Influenza Pandemic among the Saudi Public

I acknowledge with thanks the receipt of the comments of the reviewers as well as the comment of the associate editor regarding the above mentioned manuscript. These comments were highly beneficial in the modification of the manuscript. The manuscript was revised according to all these comments. All modifications and/or corrections are highlighted in RED. A list of these modifications is shown below.

I appreciate you would kindly acknowledge the receipt of the revised manuscript. Looking forward to hearing from you.

Best regards

1. Abstract:
   a. Numerator/denominator information was added.
   b. Decimal places were fixed.
2. Background:
   a. Spelling mistakes and typographical errors were corrected.
   b. Contextual information in terms of the Saudi population, governmental policies and communication strategies during the pandemic were described in details.
3. Methods:
   a. The time of conduction of the study was stated.
   b. Exclusion criteria for participation were written.
4. Results:
   a. The total number of participants approached as well as the number of those who were successfully interviewed were stated.
   b. Demographic information were presented in a table (table 1).
   c. Representation of the study population was described in some details.
   d. There was no difference between men and women ($\chi^2 = 1.33$, $p=0.52$) in the awareness. Level of education was measured and is there in the demographic data (Table 1).
   e. The concept “Panic” was modified. The word “Concern” was used all through the manuscript.
5. Discussion:
   a. Discussion was updated with the recommended recent pandemic H1N1 manuscripts.
   b. Results of the present study were incorporated more into the discussion.
   c. The survey from NSW Department of health was referenced as recommended.
   d. The explanation to the beliefs of the public in the reports of MOH was revised.
   e. The word “dangerous impression” was deleted.
   f. Conclusion was revised as appropriate.
6. Competing interests, authors’ contribution as well as acknowledgements were included.