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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions are needed.

The authors question the knowledge and attitude of university students towards H1N1 and the factors associated with H1N1 vaccine refusal in India, during post pandemic period. This topic has not been thoroughly debated in medical journals and it may be of interest to the readers BMC Infectious Diseases.

ABSTRACT:

Abstract is relevant to the manuscript. However major changes are needed in the results section of the abstract once the manuscript is revised according to the suggestions (please see comments titled “results” below).

INTRODUCTION:

1. The first paragraph needs to be shortened since it is not directly related to the study.

METHODS:

Some clarification is needed in this section.

1. How was the sample of students selected for the study (1000 out of 17 200).
2. Data collection and analysis subheading ends with “coded answers were unified to a list of response patterns”. Can the authors please specify what were those “response patterns”.
3. Did the authors gather any information about personal risks of students who accepted or declined the vaccine (for example did the students who were vaccinated have any other condition such as chronic medical disease, being a medical school student, etc).
4. Was the statistical analysis performed only for gender?

RESULTS:

1. Results section includes too many details both written in the text and shown on the tables.
2. Can the authors please statistically compare the vaccinated and unvaccinated
group with regard to their sociodemographic characteristics (such as age, gender, type of school), knowledge of H1N1 influenza, perception about the effectiveness and side effects of vaccine and perception about other preventive measures, etc.

3. Using a table that combines above mentioned characteristics (and excluding Figure 1) will better reflect the authors findings.

4. Figure 2 is not necessary.

DISCUSSION:

1. The first 16 lines of discussion are more convenient for the introduction section.

2. The discussion needs to be divided into paragraphs (for example cost of vaccine, risk perception, gender difference and knowledge about disease prevention are all discussed in one paragraph in the present version).

3. Since studies about post pandemic vaccine acceptance are very limited, can the authors please compare their findings with local and international data during the pandemic.

REFERENCES:

1. References must be checked. For example the sentence “This is in contrast to the study reported by Akan………” does not have a reference properly placed. The same also applies to the sentence “In the study of Kamate and coworkers….”. Many other comments on the discussion section lack references.

LANGUAGE

Although the language is understandable numerous grammer errors need to be corrected.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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