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Reviewer’s report:

Major Revisions
N/A

Minor Essential Revisions:
1. There is a “,” after “age” in the list on page 6. To be consistent with the rest of the list, there should be a “;” instead. List formatting is also inconsistent with lists on pages 5, 10, 14 (and the list formatting is inconsistent within page 5). For example, no punctuation mark, a “;” and a “:” all precede different lists.
2. There are several incorrect uses of quotation marks. See http://www.grammarbook.com/punctuation/quotes.asp for helpful hints about where quotation marks go (e.g. outside of periods).
3. The last sentence of Results section, Avoidance subsection (“Compared…(AOR=191, p=0.094)”) should have the word “to” after the word “relation.” I also think a comma would be more appropriate than a semicolon here, but that is more of a discretionary point.
4. A comma after “2002” in this sentence would improve readability: “Since the first Bali bombing in 2002 the behavioural focus of Australian Government information campaigns has primarily related to increased vigilance (e.g. “Be alert, not alarmed”, “Let#s look out for Australia”) and the reporting of suspicious behaviours to authorities. [28]”
5. As it is currently written, I am unsure this sentence supports your argument on vulnerability and avoidance responses: “At the same time, these “vulnerable” groups are increasingly recognised as key planning partners who can uniquely inform community preparedness for terrorism. [33]” Generally, I think this paragraph can be more organized. A potential framework for organizing this paragraph is: “The study team has collected information on vulnerability. Some of these variables were shown to be positively associated with avoidance responses. This supports data from a study in Canada. A possible explanation for these avoidance responses is lack of resources. These individuals are known as key planning partners, and public health emergency planners should work through this issue with them now.” By no means is this the only way to structure this paragraph, but I think cleaning it up one way or another will help the reader get to where you are trying to take them a little bit faster.
6. Page 14: “Willing” should replace “willingness”

Discretionary Revisions
1. The results include some very high AORs, with low p-values, indicating significant and substantial differences. It may be possible to underscore salient AORs if they were discussed in terms of interpretation, rather than simply stating “significantly higher.”

2. The scale on the figure (which looks great!) is only on the positive side. Could this be included on the negative side, as well?

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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