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The Editor, BMC Infectious Diseases

Re: MS: 1747165386127289 - Meningococcal, influenza virus, and hepatitis B virus vaccination coverage level among health care workers in Hajj

Dear the Editor

Thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to revise the above mentioned manuscript in light of the valuable reviewers' comments. The following are the details of how the manuscript was revised and a point by point response to the reviewers' comments:

Reviewer: Robyn Gershon

General

Regarding the human subjects, it is usually noted by convention whether the self-administered survey was confidential or anonymous and whether or not institutional review board approval was obtained, perhaps with an exemption.

Response:

The section "Data collection" under the Methods was rewritten as follows to clarify these points. "The Saudi Ministry of Health approved the study. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire which included demographic data and data on vaccination history. The questionnaire was anonymously self-administered by HCWs with supervision from the research team members."
Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

- Page 1: Abstract, Results, line 1-2, change to read: “A total of 392 HCWs were studied including 215 (54.8%) nurses and 177 (45.2%) doctors.”

- Abstract, Results Section, line 5, replace “of whom” with “with”
- Abstract, Results Section, line 5, replace “received” with “receiving”
- Page 2: Introduction, line 3, insert “employee” after “successful”
- Introduction, line 9, insert a comma after “Saudi Arabia”
- Page 3: Methods, paragraph 1, line 12, replace “can not” with “cannot”
- Page 4: Methods, Data Collection: Comment: Confidential or anonymous? Human subjects approval relevant? If so, please add a sentence.
- Page 5: Results, paragraph 1, line 3, replace” hundreds” with “hundred”
- Results, paragraph 1, line 4, replace” hundreds” with “hundred”
- Page 9: Discussion, paragraph 1, line 6, insert “earlier reports;” after “similar to”
- Discussion, paragraph 1, line 7, delete “what was reported as”

Response:

All done as requested.
Reviewer: Rodrigo R Jimenez Garcia

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

- In my opinion the paper should analyze data in more depth. No information about the age of the sample is provided, nor the distribution according to the working site or years working as a HCW.

Response:
This information was added to table 1

- No results of vaccination coverage (bivariate analysis) according to age groups, gender, nationality, degree, position and other well known predictors for vaccination such as working site or years working as a HCW, are provided.

Response:
As requested, bivariate analysis was performed and shown in a new table (table 3) and described in new paragraph in the Results section (paragraph 5) and the relevant paragraphs in the Discussion.

-A multivariate analysis (using logistic regression models) should be conducted in order to determine, after controlling for possible confounding factors, which variables are predictor for vaccination for each of the three vaccines studied.

Response:
As requested, multivariate analysis was performed. The results were added to the Results section as a new paragraph (paragraph 5).

-I understand the response rate was 100% is this correct?

Response:

Yes, indeed. The following statement "All HCWs agreed to participate in the study" in the first paragraph of the results section was rewritten as follows "All HCWs agreed to participate in the study with 100% response rate" to clarify this point.

Tariq A. Madani (corresponding author)