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**Reviewer’s report:**

The authors have carefully responded to the revisions I suggested in the earlier version of the manuscript. I have a couple of discretionary revisions as follows.

Discretionary revisions.

p16. “Some households who responded to the survey indicated that they had not had a child in home quarantine. It is impossible 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.

P16. “ however, there are no apriori 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.
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