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Dear Editor,

We thank you and the reviewers for the further feedback on our manuscript “Sources, perceived usefulness and understanding of information disseminated to families who entered home quarantine during the H1N1 pandemic in Victoria, Australia: A cross-sectional study”.

The Associate Editor suggested we respond to Reviewer One’s comments, and also clarify a sentence on page 11. Please find below the details of the revisions we have made following this recommendation.

Yours sincerely,

Anne Kavanagh

**Response to Reviewers**

The Associate Editor wrote: “*The sentence "However, because adjustment for these variables did not change the size OR significance of the coefficients of interest" page 11, is ambiguous (should be AND). Please clarify”*

**Response:** We have changed ‘or’ to ‘and’ in this sentence.
Reviewer One suggested two discretionary revisions:

- **p16.** “Some households who responded to the survey indicated that they had not had a child in home quarantine. It is possible that…” The proportion of those who indicated that they did not have a school-aged child who had been placed in home quarantine was 23 out of 1,180 (p10), which is approximately 2% of the eligible families. I know that we cannot deny the possibility that the proportion of those who were wrongly placed in the eligible families is higher among non-respondents than respondents. However, I am still not sure if this is what the authors would like to emphasis as a reason of high non-response rate.

**Response:** We have removed the relevant sentence from the discussion, as we recognise that the impact of this group on the response rate may be small.

- **P16.** “however, there are no a priori reasons to believe that the associations between understanding, information sources and compliance will be different for responders and non-responders”. I would suggest removing this sentence as it does not add any useful information.

**Response:** We have removed this sentence from the discussion.