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This study conducted survey among the Dutch population to explore their behavioral responses to an influenza pandemic by applying risk perception theories, mainly protection motivation theory or PMT.

1. The research question is clearly stated.

2. The method is appropriate to answer that question. In the method section, the authors described well about each measure that they used. However, the authors did not mention some points in this one.

Discretionary revisions:

For the sample size (participants), it is not much clear how to choose them and why are 1,099 participants.

The methods of the data collection, statistical and data analyses are not described in this section, but there are somewhat describes in the result section.

The basic information of the participants (e.g., sex, age, educational level, etc.) should be considerably moved to the first paragraph of the result.

For behavioral responses: about the scenario presented “There is a worldwide pandemic of a new influenza …….. Within five weeks 400,000 Dutch people get sick and 4,000 people die.” For this situation, the numbers of cases and deaths were presented based on what estimation (e.g., model study there or what? Why are such numbers? (because this one can lead to the responses of the participants).

3. The data obtained from this survey are sound and support the conclusion written by the researchers.

4. The manuscript adheres to the basic standards for reporting and data deposition. The study was submitted for the Ethics Committee Psychology of Maastricht University.

5. The discussions are supported by the data. However, the authors did not discuss the relevance of this study to current literatures. In the background, the authors mentioned about available empirical evidence, but did not show the relevance between this study and those studies. The conclusions are well balanced and adequately supported by the data.
6. The limitations of the work are well stated. However, the authors should mention about the participants whether this group of participants can be represented the Dutch population or not. The respondents seemed to be adults, this one would be skewed the results of the study or not? Also, as the results based on a cross-sectional survey, so temporal relationship is not well established: when the influenza pandemic is wide spread, the behavioral responses may change based on the real situation.

7. The manuscript is well referenced. There are only a few study focused on applying risk perception theories to investigate behavioral responses for an influenza pandemic. The researchers have cited them.

8. The title and abstract are convey what have been found from the study.

9. The writing is overall acceptable.

Minor essential revisions:

In p.7 (Crimando developed…..), what is pp.xxx, it would be somewhat like a reference, but it is not yet completely corrected.

In the results, page 15 (about factor analysis), eigenwarrde is eigenvalues?

Figure 2: maladaptive responses: Nothin we can do is Nothing we can do?? (Typing error?)

References: please check again, e.g., ref. 21 is not completely cited (no page).
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