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Thank you very much for your e-mail containing reviews of April 19, 2013. We are pleased to hear that our manuscript “Determinants of suboptimal hepatitis B vaccine uptake among men in the Republic of Korea: Where should our efforts be focused: Results from cross-sectional study (MS: 1712246983721118)” will be accepted for publication if revised minorly. We are submitting the revised manuscript, on which we indicated where we made changes in response to suggestions of two reviewers in yellow and a point-by-point response to reviewers’ comments.

We guarantee that this or similar material has not been and will not be submitted by my colleagues or by me to any other publication prior to its appearance in the *BMC Infectious Diseases*, and that all of my co-authors have made a substantive and specific intellectual contribution to the article.

We wish to thank you and the reviewers for the valuable comments and helpful suggestions which contributed significantly to the revision of our manuscript.
With regards,

Jae Kwan Jun, M.D., Ph.D.

National Cancer Control Institute, National Cancer Centre, 323 Ilsan-ro, Ilsandong-gu, Goyang-si, Gyeonggi-do, 410-769, Korea

Tel: +82-31-920-2184, Fax: +82-31-920-2189

E-mail: jkjun@ncc.re.kr
Point-to-Point Responses to the Reviewers’ Comments

Thank you for the valuable comments.

We revised the paper in accordance with the reviewers’ comments, and the revisions are summarized below and highlighted in the manuscript.

Reviewer: Vivian Levy

Reviewer’s report

I have no major compulsory revisions. I am satisfied with the authors’ response to my inquiries, specifically the shortcoming of not having biological outcomes has been adequately addressed. I recommend publication of this manuscript.

Minor essential revisions:

1. In the abstract, sentence in Results should be edited: Lower education was also more prevalent in the non-vaccinated group compared with the incompletely vaccinated group.

   Response:

   Following the reviewer’s comment, the authors revised as below:

   “Lower education was also more prevalent in the non-vaccinated group compared with the incompletely vaccinated group.” (Page 2, line 38-40)

2. In the Background, at the end of the first paragraph, I would remove the phrase "as a result of the HBV infection."

   Response:
Following the reviewer’s comment, the authors revised as below:

“Another study conducted in Korea reported that during the 20-year period from 1972 to 1992, 26% of HBV-infected individuals developed primary liver cancer.”

(Page 3, line 62-64)

3. In the second paragraph, the word "month" needs to be included in the sentence: In 1995, the nationwide...using a 0,1, and 6 month vaccine schedule..."

Response:

Following the reviewer’s comment, the authors revised as below:

“In 1995, the nationwide HBV vaccination program for infants, using a 0, 1, and 6 month vaccine schedule, was implemented by the National Immunization Program as part of the Communicable Diseases Prevention Act.” (Page 3, line 70-72)

4. The last sentence of the Background can be simplified to " Therefore, this study was conducted to investigate factors associated with HBV vaccine uptake in the general adult male population in Korea."

Response:

Following the reviewer’s comment, the authors revised as below:

“Therefore, this study was conducted to investigate factors associated with HBV vaccine uptake in the general adult male population in Korea.” (Page 4, line 86-88)

5. In the Discussion, p 12, the word "month" needs to be included in the sentence, "The type of vaccine....the 0, 1, 6 month schedule is applied....whereas the 0, 1, 2 month
schedule is applied.."

**Response:**

Following the reviewer’s comment, the authors revised as below:

“The type of vaccine administered determines which one of two standard schedules
is used; the 0, 1, 6 month schedule is applied when vaccinating with recombinant
HBV, whereas the 0, 1, 2 month schedule is applied when using plasma-derived
vaccine.” (Page 12, line 247-250)

6. In the Conclusions, I would not use the word "ignorance" as this is a judgemental term.
Instead, consider: "A lack of awareness about the necessity of HBV vaccination was the
most common reason for being non-vaccinated;"

**Response:**

Following the reviewer’s comment, the authors revised as below:

“A lack of awareness about the necessity of HBV vaccination was the most common
reason for being non-vaccinated;…” (Page 13, line 284-285)
Reviewer: Elke Leuridan

Reviewer's report:

The authors answered clear and concise to all the comments. No further questions arise.