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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is interesting as it presents data on perception of H1N1 influenza from China which has the experience with the SARS-outbreak. There are nevertheless a number of issues which needs to be addressed before I feel the the manuscript can be considered for publication.

Major compulsory reviews

1. The time of the survey starting in November 2009 seems late related to the course of the H1N1 pandemic. No information is given on the course of the pandemic in China. This makes it difficult to interpret the results. Some of the results may have been influenced by the fact that the survey took place in the aftermath of the pandemic, and knowledge and perception of people probably is different then it was at the height of the epidemic. The authors should clarify how the time of their survey was in relation to the course of the epidemic and explain why the decided to carry out the survey at that time.

2. Related to the first remark the authors do not give information on whether results differed between the rounds of surveys. Earlier research for example by Lau and also by De Zwart has made clear that such differences may exist. It is not clear whether this was the case in this study.

3. Not enough information is given about the questionnaire. It is not clear how the questions were formulated. This means that it is not clear whether questions on attitude and behaviour were time specific or not. It is also not clear whether the questions focused on past behaviour (in a specific time) or on intentions for future behaviour. The results presented on page 10 speak about 'the last two weeks' and later about 'would stay away from them', which seem to indicate that questions focused on past past behaviour and on intentions for future behaviour. This needs to be clarified. It would be helpful to include a link to a translated version of the questionnaire or to submit it as part of the manuscript or an appendix.

4. It is reported that there was a rather low vaccation rate for both seasonal and H1N1 influenza. No information, however, is given on regular vaccination rates for seasonal influenza, nor on vaccination policies (what age group is vaccination for seasonal influenza usually given to). There is also no specific information on the vaccination strategy for H1N1 influenza when did vaccination become available, which age groups were invited for vaccination. Because of the lack of
such information data related to vaccination rate are different to interpret.

5. On page 15 it is stated that women are 'more sensitive to the outbreak due to their physiological characteristics and concern on personal hygiene'. This statement is supported with one reference. I have difficulties interpreting this sentence. Do the authors mean that morbidity rates for H1N1 influenza for women are higher or do they mean that women have some innate characteristic which influences their attitude? Although many studies have shown that risk perception of women often is higher, there is no single explanation for this certainly not a biological one.

6. The authors conclude that 'clear disseminate of perception regarding vaccine' is necessary for higher vaccination rates. For me it is not clear how the authors come to this conclusion based on their data.

7. It would be helpful if the authors would look into the lay out of their tables. They contain much detailed information and when studying them it is not very clear what the significant data in the tables are.

Minor essential revisions
8. In table 1 there is a mistake in the number and percentage of respondents with an education background of college and above. The correct percentage is given in the text.

Discretionary revisions
9. The authors speak of a 'wrong attitude'. I would recommend using another word for 'wrong'. Attitudes can be more or less favourable from a public health perspective it does however not mean that certain attitudes are wrong.

**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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