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Reviewer's report:


Major points:

1. While the Introduction is generally well written, the content is mostly descriptive. The authors should try to review other studies from elsewhere on this topic as well as include some theoretical basis that supports the case for studying KAP. For example, is there evidence that these three variables are causally important determinants of behaviour? Increasingly, these three components on their own are not seen as particularly useful. Is there scope for a simple theoretical framework related to behaviour change? You do not have a word limit, but a concise section would strengthen the paper considerably, I believe. Otherwise, it is merely descriptive and not particularly original.

2. Methods: Justify why the final sample size of 96 respondents was chosen.

3. Results: Can you provide mean ratings (+/- standard deviation) of for example fear of catching avian influenza to give some indication of the response variance?

4. P8: “while 67% said human to human transmission was possible.” Whilst not untrue, the very limited documented transmission between human, I think only two cases documented, means that there is probably some error in this response. How do the authors distinguish between correct and incorrect beliefs about AI? I think this distinction is important because a lot of misunderstanding can be problematic in infection control as people can adopt ineffective strategies and ignore effective ones. Similarly, elsewhere in this paragraph the reader is simply given proportions, but is not told if this “knowledge” is factually correct or not.

5. Table 1: Because we are not given details about how the questions were formulated it is not possible to really determine if the data in Table 1 are valid. For example, if I say “Does washing hands protect against AI?” I might get a different answer, most likely affirmative, than if I asked “How effective is washing hands for protecting against AI?” Similarly on P9 “nearly everyone agreed…movement should be restricted…” – again how was the question asked? “Do you agree movement should be restricted…” Or “In the event of an
outbreak what should the government do to minimize spread?” The first question
leads respondents to agree, whereas the second leaves it open so is likely to be
a better reflection of belief.

6. P10. How were variables selected for the multivariate analysis? Please specify
or explain.

7. P10/11 “people who got their knowledge from newspapers had more
knowledge…” – please show a test of this claim. And later “workers more than
owners”, and “those with greater knowledge…” Where is the analysis of this?

8. P15. The issue of not reporting sick or dead poultry to authorities has been
widely reported in the literature and is not just confined to Cambodia. In part this
seems due to compensation issues, but also the fact that poultry farms are used
to chicken dying and may not recognize this as a sign of AI (which most of the
time it is not) but in the context of AI, farmers may fear a cull of their farms being
imposed and significant economic losses. These effects have also been reported
in Vietnam, China and Thailand.

Minor points:
9. P3 I think the BMC ID convention is for commas, rather than periods in
numbers above 1,000.

10. P4 Para 1: “Backyard poultry” – this sentence is a little confusing. The term
backyard poultry keeping generally refers to households that are not otherwise
classed as farms keeping poultry within the confines or area immediately
surrounding a family’s living space. Can you therefore clarify either the proportion
of non-farm households that keep backyard poultry, plus the proportion of farms
as currently stated. Otherwise, re-write the sentence just to refer to farms.

11. P5/6. Please ensure a consistent typeface is used throughout.

12. P7. Statistical analysis “Multivariate prediction was used…” – in a cross
sectional study it is incorrect to talk of prediction, which requires forecasting
something in future; more correctly, the term “association” should be used
instead. See also P10 extensively. Limitations – the authors acknowledge this
point, so why do they use the term “prediction” throughout the manuscript?

13. P7 Results: Line 2: “..two thirds…”

14. Para 2: “i.e.” Avoid use of “i.e.”, “e.g.” and other abbreviations. Instead use
‘for example” or similar phrasing.

15. Tables 2 & 3: Titles “Prediction of…” see point X above. Specify referents.
Include 95% confidence intervals of ORs.

16. P13 – “different to what has been reported in previous studies…all three
studies…” but only two references are provided.
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