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Reviewer's report:

General Comments:
This manuscript submitted by Van et al. presents a concise and focused report regarding the attitudes and perceptions of university staff and students towards the current influenza A (H1N1) pandemic. In my opinion the question is well defined and the data is sound. The title and abstract accurately convey the manuscript results. The results of this research will be of interest to both university administrators and public health decision-makers. The remainder of my comments are focused on three different types of revisions, those that are major compulsory revisions, those that are minor essential revisions but necessary for improved clarity and those that are discretionary revisions and could be addressed by the authors but are not required (in my opinion) for publication.

Major Compulsory Revisions:
1. None identified

Minor Essential Revisions:
1. On page 5 under the Lifestyle and Specific Behavioural Changes heading add the word “products” after the words “hand hygiene”. In the same paragraph, please add the word “change” after the words “recommended behaviour”.
2. On page 6, in the second paragraph, the last word of the 4th line seems to be an error.
3. On page 6, in the third paragraph, add the word “among” after the phrase “online teaching methods”
4. On page 6, in the third paragraph, delete the word “your” in the second last line.
5. On page 7, in the first paragraph, add the word “change” after “specific behaviour”
6. On page 7, in the second paragraph, you state that respondents expressed a willingness to receive influenza vaccine if “requested by authorities”. Please explain what the definition of this was for the survey. For example, some people might believe that general public health messaging around vaccine is the equivalent of a request from authorities to be vaccinated. Or is it possible that people took this to mean something different (perhaps mandatory vaccine)? This may be a limitation of the survey as it seems that without further elaboration
there may have been significant heterogeneity in terms of how people interpreted the question.

7. On page 7, in the fourth paragraph, delete the word “both” from the 7th line.

8. The spacing of reference 5 is different than the other references.

9. In table 2, I would specify that the data presented for the table represent the proportion of individuals who responded in the affirmative.

Discretionary Revisions:

1. I would be very interested in seeing a short discussion regarding the actual vaccine uptake numbers in the age groups included in the survey once vaccine was available in Australia (since over 57% indicated that they would be very willing to accept vaccine).

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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