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Editor BMC

Dear editor,

First we would like to thank you for the useful and helpful feedback we have received again. It enabled us to further improve the manuscript.

Based on the reviewer’s reports and comments from the associate editor, we revised the manuscript by using track changes.

After proofreading the manuscript we have revised all minor, essential, errors and typos mentioned by reviewer one (Melanie Taylor). Also, we have revised other minor spelling errors and other errors we have found regarding the wordings of some variables (such as fear/worry and receipt of information) to make sure they are all consistent between the text, the tables and figures and the additional files.

Based on the report of reviewer number two (Hae Jin Paek) we revised the question wordings regarding the concept of fear in the appendix. After rechecking the data we found that the concept of fear was translated in the wrong way. It was not asked as ‘to what extend are you worried…’; but as ‘to what extend are you afraid of the occurrence of an epidemic in the Netherlands’?

In previous analysis of the data we have considered to analyse fear, worry and vulnerability as one measure of risk perception. However, results indicated that these three variables were two different concepts and therefore we decided to analyse them separately. Fear and worry could be analysed as one concept (Cronbach's α: 0.672) and for that reason we choose to analyse them as one concept of fear/worry. Perceived vulnerability was therefore analysed as one separate concept. Thus, reanalyzing the data was not necessary.

We have double checked all the scales and ranges of the variables and they are all consistent between the text and the appendix. In the appendix we added a reference to the table ‘Items labelled according to the Protection Motivation Theory’ for clarification.

As the associate editor suggested, we did choose to keep the non-significant results in the tables for completeness. However, we have left out some non-significant results in the text itself.

Finally, we have proofread the article and we have made changes to the manuscript regarding the outline of the manuscript, manuscript and author details on the title page, references, figures (figures have been cropped), figure legends (legends are now presented in the manuscript, instead of in the figures themselves), tables, and additional files, to make sure that it conforms to the style of the journal.