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Author’s response to reviews: see over
Dear Editor,

Thank you for your interest. Below you will find our point-by-point responses to the concerns pointed out in the referees’ reports and editorial requests, which you will find with ‘tracked changes’ after each comment.

Yours sincerely,
Raika Durusoy

Reviewer's report – Referee 1
Title: Did the pandemic have an impact on influenza vaccination attitude? A survey among health care workers
Version: 4 Date: 1 November 2010
Reviewer: Helen Maltezou
Reviewer’s report:
No more suggestions.
Level of interest: An article of limited interest
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being Published
The English of the manuscript was corrected by two professionals.
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests.

Reviewer's report – Referee 2
Title: Did the pandemic have an impact on influenza vaccination attitude? A survey among health care workers
Version: 4 Date: 27 October 2010
Reviewer: Giuseppe La Torre
Reviewer’s report:
The authors have addressed satisfactorily all the suggestions I made, and overall
the manuscript has been much improved, also considering the amendments requested by the other reviewers

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.

**Declaration of competing interests:**
I declare that I have no competing interests

---

**Reviewer's report – Referee 3**

**Title:** Did the pandemic have an impact on influenza vaccination attitude? A survey among health care workers

**Version:** 4  **Date:** 12 November 2010  
**Reviewer:** Udo Buchholz

**Reviewer's report:**
- on page 6 it says that 91.3% of the sample was covered. I would suggest to rephrase: "...91.3% (n=807) of the intended sample size of 884 was reached"

  *The suggested rephrasing was done.*

- abstract: pls state the total number of participants so that percentages can be more easily understood. I already said in my first review that n and N need to be given conveniently and consistently, e.g. by using n(%) of N, or: "Among N participants, n(%) were ...". It is unpleasant for the reader if he/she has has to put the numbers together him/herself.

The total number of participants (807) was already stated in the Methods section of the abstract. The first sentence of the Results section was modified as follows:

  "Among a total of 807 participants, 363 (45.3%) were doctors and 293 (36.6%) were nurses."

  *to put the number closer.*

- abstract: I cannot follow the 30.4% vacc rate. There are 363+293+153=809 participants. Of these 228 were vaccinated which is 28%.

  As mentioned on page 9 in the text, “Among participants, 92.8% (n=749) had provided their open names on their questionnaires, thus their vaccination status could be tracked.”

Thus, this information was added to the abstract as follows: “Among the 749 staff whose vaccination status could be tracked, 228 (30.4%) actually received the H1N1 vaccine.”

- abstract: in the conclusion it says that the vacc rate was higher than in the previous seasonal year, pls state the percentage.

  The seasonal vaccination rate was mentioned in the second sentence of the Results section, but, mistakenly, we had written the season as 2009-2010, instead of 2008-2009. The years in that sentence were corrected: “Their seasonal influenza vaccination rate was 19.0% (n=153) for the 2008-2009 season.” And the percentages were added to the last sentence of the conclusion: “Although low overall, vaccination rates of HCWs (30.4%) were higher than their seasonal influenza vaccination rates in the previous year (19.0%).”

  *- "confounding effect": is this not rather an effect modification?  
  Yes, you are right, sorry for the error. Replaced “confounding” with “effect modification".*

---

**Editorial requests**
- Please can you include an explanation in your manuscript about why ethical approval wasn't required.
  
  The sentences: “Before the study, approval was obtained from the hospital’s managers to conduct this study. Ethical committee approval was not required since it was not an experimental study.” and “Particular attention was paid to the confidentiality of the data and analyses were done and presented anonymously.” were added to the Methods section to clarify this issue.

- Further consideration of your manuscript is conditional on improvement of the English used. Please ensure particular attention is paid to the abstract. You should have a native English speaking colleague help you with this, if possible, or use a commercial copyediting service. Examples are those provided by the Manuscript Presentation Service (www.biomedes.co.uk), International Science Editing (http://www.internationalscienceediting.com/) and English Manager Science Editing (http://www.sciencemanager.com/). BioMed Central has no first-hand experience of these companies.

  English proofreading was done by two professionals.