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Dear Reviewers;

Below: please find a summary of the modifications which we made in the manuscript to answer your requests:

**Reviewer: Arja R R Aro**

**1) Divers**

a). We changed the wording to consistently report “self-reported knowledge” through the manuscript. We added the limitation of the study including the absence of contents questions (see discussion section).

We agree with the reviewer that actual knowledge should be measured by content questions. This limitation is now discussed in the new version.

b). The terminology used in the manuscript was probably confusing. Risk perception was measured as the level of anxiety felt by the study population. We clarified this point by writing “perceived risk” instead of “concerns, threats, etc” to remove confusion as much as possible. However, we agree that more appropriate definitions, methods could be used.

c). Table 4: These are transmission routes reported by the study population. The word “Reported” was added to the title to eliminate ambiguity.

d). The objective of the question was to evaluate the importance of epidemics among other preoccupation. A sentence was added to the manuscript to clarify this point as requested.

**2) Discussion**

a). The sentence was modified as requested.

b). The reported level of confidence (21% fully confident) correspond to the answer given in the case of occurrence of a highly infectious disease. The manuscript was corrected to remove ambiguity. We believe that preventive actions implemented by the government after the epizooty of avian influenza together with other reasons mentioned in the manuscript could explain partly why epidemics were considered as a threat by only one quarter of the population.

Preventive measures were communicated by official reports of the Ministry of Health.

c). The association was not analyzed. We agree that the sentence was confusing. The exact meaning of the sentence was “Young people feel less concerned by nosocomial infections and therefore do not inform them-selves on this infectious disease while older subjects are more concerned about nosocomial infections and less worried about AIDS”. The sentence was deleted to remove ambiguity.

d). That’s right. The statement did not come from the study directly. However, such attitudes of compliance have already been seen. We added two references to support our statement.

e). We added the results of the suggested paper and compared them to our results.
3) Conclusion

a). The conclusion was rearranged to reflect the study findings.

b). The contradictory statement was removed.

c). The sentence was removed from the abstract.

4) Other

The article summary line was modified to reflect the finding of the study.

Reviewer: Onna de Zwart

Page 6: The date of the occurrence of avian influenza in France was added to the manuscript.

Questionnaire: We agree to make the questionnaire available on-line. However, it will take time to translate it. This work can be done during the time the manuscript will be under revision in order to have it ready in the case our manuscript is accepted for publication. Is that convenient to you?

Yours sincerely

Mitra Saadatian-Elahi