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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

We acknowledge with thanks the receipt of the comments of the reviewers. We also thank for Editorial comments/requirements. These comments/requirements were highly beneficial in the modification of the manuscript. The manuscript was revised according to all these comments. All modifications and/or corrections are highlighted by using the track changes mode. A point-to-point response to the reviewers’ comments was attached. We appreciate you kindly offer the opportunity to transfer our manuscript.

Best!
Tiegang. Li
Email: Tiegang1977@126.com

Responses to Reviewer #1:

Comments:
The literature review and discussions are highly selective, omitting several studies done on poultry-related buying, handwashing and other influenza preventive behaviours that have been published in the past 8 years. For example, the work of Liao and colleagues has reported on several aspects that this study addresses, as well as presenting a comprehensive model for population reactions to influenzas. These omissions give the impression that the work is more original than is in fact the case. There is substantial work on changes to poultry buying in southern China and elsewhere, during influenza epidemics, and on influenza vaccination uptake determinants that is not included.

Respond:
Thank you for your advice, we have added all of 6 references in discussion section.

Comments:
There is no multivariate analysis to adjust for factors that might interact; for example there is likely to be an age x gender interaction in terms of use of internet; older retailers may not use the internet as much as younger males.

Respond:
As suggestion, we conducted the multivariate analyses to identify the significant independent variables. We added these analyses as following, and for this work, two additional tables (table 5 and table 6) were added.

Method section:
“Multivariate logistic regression analyses were used to clarify the relationship between different ways/methods of getting H7N9 information and demographic variables, and identify the significant independent predictors of acceptance of a H7N9 vaccine, calculating odds ratios (OR) after controlling for gender, age, and other demographics. These analyses were carried out using SPSS version 17.0 (SPSS Inc. 2008). Statistical significance was considered at P < 0.05 for all analyses.”

Result section:
“We also conducted multivariate analysis of willingness to accept H7N9 vaccine on some independent predictors, together with demographics (including sex, age group, marital status, education level, living area, annual income, and place of birth) being forced into the logistic regression model. Table 6 detailed the result
of the multivariate analysis. History of influenza vaccination within recent three years (OR=1.97, P<0.05) and worry about getting H7N9 virus (OR for worry, more worry and very worry was 2.06, 2.78 and 3.58, respectively, P<0.05) were significantly associated with higher intention to receive the H7N9 vaccine.”

Comment:
The work is rather superficial and lacks an in depth analysis that the large data set would lend itself to. As it stands it adds very little to our understanding of population responses to influenzas.

Response:
As suggestion, we conducted the multivariate analysis. We acknowledged some of our findings are very similar to previous findings reported during the beginning of pH1N1, SARS and H5N1. Our investigation was conducted in the three months after first human infection case reported in China and one month after chicken were also found to be infected in Guangzhou. We reported this survey because we think our findings reflecting public's attitudes and practices in that specific time may be useful for policy and practitioners to develop a correct strategy for H7N9 control and prevention. We also identified the information needs once H7N9 outbreak in Guangzhou. These may be useful for improving health education in the next step. In addition, our study also may have it reference value for the future researches in different countries and different stage of H7N9.

Comments:
Minor revisions: There is need to attend to the English grammar which in places needs correcting.

Response:
Thanks, we have asked an English-speaking researcher from Kentucky, USA to revise it. We think the revised manuscript is now more acceptable and easy to understand for readers.

Responses to Reviewer #2:
Comments:
I only have a concern about the situation for taking face-to-face interview.
Authors found that the majority of study participants thought that the H7N9 information published by government was accurate and transparent. It is a good result; however, the study was conducted by the Guangzhou CDC. If the participants knew about the Guangzhou CDC conducted the investigation, the answer by the residents in Guangzhou might be some influences to the question asking about the works for the government. How did authors manage about this concern? If they did a masking or some efforts, it should be included in the study method.
Response

Yes, in order to get the accurate information, we have masked our occupation when explaining the nature of this study to interviewees. We added the following sentence in method section as suggestion:

“Given some questions in this study were on the government’s work, the response might be untruthfully if participants knew that this investigation was conducted by Guangzhou CDC, we therefore masked our occupation when explaining the nature of this study to interviewees.”

Comments:
Spelling mistakes
p. 3 line 14 (in the section of Background)
ASRS……it might mean SARS.

Response:
The comment is right, we have changed as suggestion.

Responses to Editor

Editor’s Comment:
"Reviewer 1 notes that your work is incompletely contextualised within the existing literature in this field and provides a list of references which must be incorporated appropriately in your manuscript. Please attend to this and his other comments regarding statistical analysis and the need for professional copy-editing for English expression. Your revised manuscript should be marked to reflect changes, and a detailed point by point rebuttal letter prepared to explain your response to reviewers."

Response:
As suggestion, we have read those references in detail and incorporated all of 6 in our manuscript (reference 20-25). In addition, we also conducted the multivariate analysis, please see the method and result section. We have asked an English-speaking researcher from Kentucky, USA to revise it. The revised manuscript is now more acceptable and easy to understand for readers.

Editorial Requirement:
Copyediting: After reading through your manuscript, we feel that the quality of written English needs to be improved before the manuscript can be considered further. We advise you to seek the assistance of a fluent English speaking colleague, or to have a professional editing service correct your language. Please ensure that particular attention is paid to the abstract.

Response:
We have asked an English-speaking researcher from Kentucky, USA to revise the whole manuscript.
Requirement:
--> In addition, please provide a copy of your questionnaire as an additional file.

Response:
As requirement, we added the questionnaire as an additional file.