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Reviewer's report:

Comments
1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined? Yes
2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Not entirely, see below
3. Are the data sound? Yes
4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes
5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? Yes
6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes
7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? yes
9. Is the writing acceptable? Yes

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Abstract
- Methods: I would mention the mean / median age of the sample.
Methods
- why was the survey carried out in the military? The individuals involved do not represent the general population.
- You involved about 3,000 persons in your survey. It would be interesting to know, how many people are on average involved in the military service. In other words, it would be worth to mention whether your sample represents a big/ small proportion of all persons involved in the military service in Singapore.
- page 7: how where (apart from the cases) the servicemen and health care workers selected being contacted? Were they randomly selected?
Table 1.
- I would prefer to have a table with the original questions instead of mentioning the topics discussed.

Table 4

- I would recommend to mark/mention the reference group with a footnote

Discussion

- Page 13: higher educational level is mentioned to be a negative predictor of good practice. This reflects also knowledge from European and US studies, showing that higher education is associated with lower vaccine uptake. Probably, it would be worth to mention this.

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

Methods

- Page 9: I assume that the associations given in the manuscript (‘R’) are odds ratios? Please mention in the methods, how you have assessed these associations (odds ratios, relative risk, ...).
- If you are talking about odds ratios, the word ‘association’ would be more accurate than using ‘correlations’.

Results

- Page 9: what could be the reason of the low response rate of HCWs?
- Page 11/12: there is lots of information in the results, and somehow the reader gets overwhelmed by all the numbers and associations mentioned. I would recommend referencing the according table.

Table 4

- Please give a footnote, what ‘B’ references to. There may be readers, which are not aware of it.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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