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Reviewer's report:

After previous revisions, the remaining challenge with this manuscript (other than readability) is the discussion/conclusion/application of results. I would encourage the authors to review these sections more carefully and consider, specifically, what their findings might add to vaccination promotion efforts in future pandemics. The current discussion is somewhat confused and, at times, contradictory. For example, the authors begin by saying that “During the current swine flu pandemic, encouraging vaccination uptake focused on providing information [25]. This is similar to interventions to improve uptake of ordinary seasonal influenza vaccination [29], which have met with limited success,” but then go on to say that “Information could be provided about how vaccination can reduce people’s worries of contracting pandemic flu and how a vaccination would probably mean fewer visits to the doctor.” If their point is that the wrong types of information have been supplied in the past, and that their findings suggest different types of information should be included, then the authors should state this concretely and expand the discussion of this important point.

The limitations section could also be expanded. For example, instead of stating that there may have been selection bias, the authors might consider how, if present, that would have affected their findings.

Finally, the main conclusion that “Theoretical frameworks which identify determinants that influence decisions to have a pandemic influenza vaccination are useful,” seems unfounded, since their utility has not been demonstrated in this paper.

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS

Grammatical/typographical Changes

The following grammatical changes (in CAPS) should be made:

“An online survey in Italy during August 2009 investigating parents’ willingness to have their CHILDREN vaccinated with H1N1 vaccine reported that only 12.8% of mothers said they would allow their children to be vaccinated and 44.4% REMAINED doubtful [6].”

Parentheses should be closed in two instances towards the end of this sentence:

“Perceived behavioural control comprises two separate factors: self-efficacy (a person’s perceived confidence and perceived difficulty in performing the
behaviour [11] and perceived control (a person's belief about their ability to control the behaviour in question [12].”

In this sentence, a colon should be used after model and the first of the parentheses should be removed:

“We therefore also included the four variables used in this model (perceived susceptibility (risk of getting the condition)…”

The following grammatical changes (in CAPS) should be made:

“…a detailed (11 page) document [24] was delivered to every household in the UK during May 2009, AND MADE available online.”

As mentioned in an earlier review, the word “to” should be changed to “flu” in the sentence below:

“This was part of an international study on swine flu vaccination which investigated intention to have a swine FLU vaccination…”

For precision, please rephrase the following sentence from “Exclusion criteria for this paper were: non UK residents, health care workers and other vaccination priority groups [4],” to “Non-UK residents, healthcare workers, and other vaccination priority groups were excluded from this analysis.” Also, please clarify whether you mean ALL other vaccination priority groups, and if not, which specific ones you are referring to.

The “of” before “with lower scores” should be removed in the following sentence:

“Cronbach alpha for these items was 0.79 and so the mean of the 5 items was taken as an overall measure, of with lower scores indicating high subjective norm.”

Add hyphen after past in the following subheading and check spacing next to hyphens and dashes throughout manuscript (should be no spaces between future and related):

“Past and future-related behaviours”

Substantive Changes

If the leaflets were not distributed to households, how did they reach the public?

“However, this leaflet was not delivered to households [25].”
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