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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

General comments:

The study was to compare paediatricians’ opinions about the 2009 influenza A/H1N1 pandemic and the vaccination against it before and after the vaccination campaign in Canada and examine factors that influenced paediatricians' intention to recommend this novel vaccine to their patients. Although the authors showed an improvement of paediatricians’ perceived information sufficiency, acceptance of the novel vaccine and their intention to recommend the vaccination to their patients after the vaccination campaign, it is a pity that the change of paediatricians’ actual practices such as how frequently had they talked about or recommended the vaccination to their patients for preventing the pandemic influenza were not studied. Besides, since some points were missed to explain or explained unclearly, the paper remains quite confused to the readers.

Specific comments:

1. Abstract
The potential application or public health implication of the study results should be stated in the conclusion.

2. Background
Paragraph 1: details of the health impact of the 2009 influenza A/H1N1 pandemic and how media reported these events in Canada before the vaccination campaign should be introduced because all this information may influence the paediatricians’ knowledge, attitudes and perceptions related to this influenza pandemic and vaccination against it.

3. Methods
Paragraph 2: Details about the vaccination campaign need to be provided including the periods of the campaign, what types of information were provided, through which types of channels and how frequently the information was provided as well as the information coverage of this campaign. Also, was the vaccine provided during the campaign? When was the pandemic influenza A/H1N1 vaccine provided in Canada? The authors excluded all missing responses from the analysis. However, proportions of missing responses need to
be added.

Paragraph1: the purpose of using Multiple Correspondence Analysis should be well stated in the first sentence.

4. Results
Paragraph 3, Sentence 2: the statement is inconsistent with the figure showed in Table 2, please check. Sentence 3: should it be “fewer” rather than “few”? Sentence 4: if $p=0.041<0.05$, I think the proportions were not comparable but statistically significantly different. Sentence 5: should it be “vaccine recipients” rather than “vaccine providers”? And please check this throughout the manuscript.

Paragraph 4: not familiar with MCA therefore cannot comment on the results of MCA.

5. Discussion
Paragraph 1: the authors stated that “previous studies had assessed health care workers’ acceptability of …”, so how about the results compared to that of this study?

Paragraph 2: Sentence 3 “for example…” can be deleted. If the details of the vaccination campaign were not provided in the method section as I suggested above, it can be provided here and discuss in depth how this campaign would influence the doctors’ attitudes and knowledge. Besides, in the last sentence of this paragraph, the authors mentioned that “this change may be attributable to increased education efforts, but may also…” it is better if more in-depth discussion is provided here about how the following factors may also influence doctors’ knowledge, attitudes and perception: the reports of A/H1N1 cases or deaths in Canada, the vaccine associated adverse events and the media focus.

A paragraph to discuss the potential application or public health implication of the study results should be added after discussing the limitations of the study.

Table 1: the labels of the second, the third and the forth columns (“before N=914”, “after N=197” and “p-value”) should be put in the first row of the table.

Table 2: “Vaccinators” is not correct. Should it be “vaccine recipients”?

Table 3: why is the sample equal to 709 rather than 914? Please also correct “vaccinators”.
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