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Reviewer’s report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? More or less (see below)
3. Are the data sound? Yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes
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 Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?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? Yes
9. Is the writing acceptable? No

Major Compulsory Revisions:

The paper of Dr Lin and colleagues describes appropriately the objective, methods, and results of the survey conducted. However, the study provides descriptive data about knowledge, attitudes and practices (KAP) against A/H1N1 2009 influenza-pandemic in China, although the authors could go into their subject in greater depth by use of multivariate analyses.

Tables 3-6 cross tabulate all KAP variables with all socio-demographic variables presented in Table 1 (gender, age categories, occupation, and level of education). First, these Tables are hard to read and do not adjust for confounding factors. Second, the authors do not investigate variables used in their sampling strategy, i.e., 7 urban and 2 rural regions and the survey period that covered 4 months from early December 2009 to the end of March 2010, while they are indeed of interest to show differences across regions and time trends. Third, the correlation structure of the data that is quite typical of KAP studies is not explored. While factor analysis may not be appropriate to determine underlying factors given the limited number of variables recorded, the authors could carry out multiple logistic regression analyses with one (or more) dependent variables (i.e., practices) and some selection procedure of explanatory factors. The multivariate analysis of the determinants of the A/H1N1 pandemic vaccine uptake is of particular interest.
Minor Essential Revisions:

1) page 5, first paragraph: reference 9 is not appropriate.
2) page 7: are individuals carrying a cell phone eligible by the sampling method?
3) page 14, second paragraph: references 20 to 22 are about “avian” flu, not 2009 “swine” flu, and inferences should be tempered; last paragraph: if pandemic vaccination was free only for priority groups, then coverage is expectedly low in the general population.
4) page 15, second paragraph: “Female is sensitive to the outbreak due to their physiological characteristics and concern on personal hygiene” seems not an argument supported by evidence; “the high degree of anxiety in the well-educated group…” could be supported by references from the A/H1N1 pandemic abroad.
5) Consider replacing “precautionary” by “preventive” measures throughout the text.
6) The manuscript should be proof-read by a native English speaker. I suggest below some replacements:

Overall: KAP refers usually to knowledge, attitudes and practices

Page 2: “closed-ended” instead of “self-structured”; “were confused”/”confused”; “immunization”/”inoculation”; delete “Comparing with male, the other occupational and educational groups”

Page 4: delete “the previously”; delete “consecutively”; “March”/”Mar”; “a series of”/”serial”

Page 5: “contributed to”/”subsequently promoted”; “10,000”/”10 thousand”

Page 6: I did not understand “Each phase included two times, once per two weeks”. Reference 13 is not referring to a sampling method but provides an example of the method

Page 7: “phase”/”phrase”; delete “intermittently”;

Page 11: “healthcare”/”healthy care”

Page 13: “to encourage”/”that encouraging”; “related”/”contributed”

Page 14: delete “Injecting”

Page 16: “strengthen”/”strength”; delete “innate”

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

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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