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**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.

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

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...." 

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."

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...."

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;"

**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.
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