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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

We acknowledge with thanks the receipt of the comments of the reviewer. 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:
This paper is now improved. However, I feel the manuscript still remains a bit under-developed. While the authors mention different messages for different groups, I get the feeling that they have underemphasised some of their findings. For example, 1 in 5 young people ask their friends rather than seek more formal information; men consistently show less in the way of protection behaviours (or women more); finally worry is the strongest predictor of vaccination uptake. These results are all mentioned in the Discussion but they could be more developed. What does the literature suggest is the reason for these differences. That they are very widely found has implications for how people perceive and respond to risks. The ms would be strengthened by some discussion of this, or of how authorities can get around some of these differences if needed. However, it
is up to the authors to decide if they wish to do this.

Respond:

Thank you for your advice. As your suggestion, we strengthened discussion as flowing:

(1) Regarding the “1 in 5 young people ask their friends rather than seek more formal information”, we further discussed as flowing:

“In addition, it is worth noting that among the young participants, over one-fifth chose “ask friends” rather than seeking a more formal information source. This should be addressed in targeting intervention efforts specifically at young people.”

(2) Regarding the “men consistently show less in the way of protection behaviors” we further discussed as flowing:

“Furthermore, our data revealed that men were less likely to adopt comprehensive precautionary measures against H7N9, such as washing hands and reducing social events. A deeper understanding of the root causes of such differential risk behavior can help inform the development of dissemination strategies directed at different subgroups. Several previous studies have also indicated that men are less likely to follow behavioral recommendations (such as hand washing) to prevent the transmission of H1N1 influenza, SARS, and other infectious diseases. Therefore, men need special targeting for health education, especially to improve their knowledge of influenza, because knowledge of influenza and perceived effectiveness of personal hygiene practices (PHPs) has been shown to be associated with PHPs.”

(3) Regarding “worry is the strongest predictor of vaccination uptake” we further discussed as flowing:

“Worry was found to be the strongest predictor of vaccination uptake. Consistent with our finding, Liao et al. also reported that perceived low risk from pH1N1 could inhibit pH1N1 vaccine uptake. That means if the public believes that the severity of A/H7N9 is lower, the acceptance rate may decline. During the early stage of the pH1N1 pandemic (May-June, 2009), international studies assessing willingness to receive the pH1N1 vaccine indicated rates that ranged from 36.9% to 49.6%. However, national data from Australia collected in November and December 2009, when the public believed that the pandemic was coming to an end, showed that there had only been a 14% uptake of the vaccine. Therefore, combining our finding with previous published literatures suggests that when levels of worry are generally low, acting to increase the volume of mass media and advertising coverage is likely to increase the perceived efficacy of recommended behaviors, which, in turn, is likely to increase their vaccination uptake.”

Responses to Editor
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.

For authors who wish to have the language in their manuscript edited by a native-English speaker with scientific expertise, BioMed Central recommends Edanz (www.edanzediting.com/bmc1). BioMed Central has negotiated a 10% discount to the fee charged to BioMed Central authors by Edanz. Use of an editing service is neither a requirement nor a guarantee of acceptance for publication.

Response:

As suggestion, we asked Edanz to help us to conduct professional language editing and now the manuscript is more clearly and easy to understand for readers. We also attached the editorial certificate of our manuscript.