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December 15, 2010

Dr. Melissa Norton, Editor-in-Chief
BMC Public Health
BioMed Central Ltd
Middlesex House
34-42 Cleveland Street
London UK
W1T 4LB

Dear Dr. Norton:

On behalf of the Public Health Agency of Canada/Canadian Institutes of Health Research Influenza Research Network (PCIRN) Vaccine Coverage Theme Group, I am pleased to resubmit the revised manuscript, “Perceptions of frontline staff regarding data collection methodologies used during the 2009 A H1N1 influenza immunization campaign in Canada”, for consideration as a research article in the BMC Public Health Journal.

The reviewer comments have been pasted into the table below along with the authors’ reply and the status of the change.

Thank you for your consideration and we look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Julie Foisy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewers’ Comments</th>
<th>Author’s Reply</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General: is there any possibility to add some more results/data from this survey? For a full-text article I would expect some more ‘meat on the bone’.</td>
<td>This is a descriptive study based on a questionnaire consisting of 7 questions that assessed user perceptions (questionnaire included in appendix A) that was completed as part of the larger on-site assessment. We have described all the results from this assessment in the results section and included a link to a manuscript for the larger on-site assessment in the methods section. Breaking down the results by paper and hybrid methods and by staff responsibilities has added to the results however this is the full extent of the results.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how many staff members have been asked to achieve the final sample size? you mentioned that 300 members have responded, but how many were asked to complete the questionnaire</td>
<td>The staff members that were observed as part of the on-site assessment were asked to fill out the questionnaire. The number of staff approached to take part in the study was not tracked, however in consultation with the research associates that attended the clinics, we understand very few refused. We have added the following to the results section: “The number of staff who refused to respond to the survey was not tracked; however it is believed to be very few.”</td>
<td>Added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Methods: I would suggest that the authors add the reference to the time and motion study mentioned in the author?s reply (Quach S, et al. Time and motion study to compare electronic and hybrid data collection systems during the pandemic (H1N1) 2009 influenza vaccination campaign. Vaccine (2010), doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2010.09.016). I think this is an interesting information.</td>
<td>Thank-you, this is a good point. It has been added to the methods section: “Results from the time and motion study, a part of the larger on-site assessment, have been published elsewhere[3].”</td>
<td>Added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The point I mentioned in regard to table 2 (The sample size for the electronic method (nurses) is possibly not very meaningful): Why do the authors not add their answer</td>
<td>This is included in the limitations section. We have added clarification (in red) in that the sample mainly consisted of staff using a paper system.</td>
<td>Added.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to this concern in the discussion (under the limitations)?".

| “Finally, the questionnaire was only completed by frontline staff who were observed for the time and motion study, which mainly consisted of those using a paper method. Because of this limited sample, our comparisons may have inadequate power to detect a true difference between methods.” |