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The Biomed Central Editorial Team,

Object: MS: 7539877506153632 - Community responses to communication campaigns for Influenza A (H1N1): A focus group study. Lesley Gray et al.

Thank you for consideration of our manuscript for publication in your journal. We have reviewed the above manuscript according to your reviewer’s comments.

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Author Amendments

Page 1 - Authors names and addresses – corrected for format

Page 3 – Conclusions – have moved last paragraph to first.

Editor’s comment

Standard text is enough – removed italics throughout document. Edited sub-headings in Results section to meet template requirements.

Reviewer # 1 (P Kermode)

MINOR COMMENTS:
1. The methods – qualitative data and analysis into themes is appropriate – perhaps could be more succinct
Methods section has been further edited to make more succinct.

DISCRETIONARY REVISIONS:
2. Revisions to Background section
We have refined the Background section of the Abstract and the main section to more clearly relate the place of this research in context of the 2009 and 2010 H1N1 campaigns.

3. Consider commencing the Methods section with the 3rd sentence of the Methods section of the Abstract. Don’t fully understand why Maori were treated differently. Consider substituting quotation marks.
We have re-ordered the Methods section and added a new sentence to second paragraph -

We have added an explanation relating to why Maori were treated differently on page 6. We have added 2 references in relation to this paragraph which required references from number 10 to be re-numbered.

Have left quotation marks ‘as is’

4. Page 5, 1st line - change word ‘of’ to ‘on’
Done

5. Consider substituting quotation marks page 6 2nd paragraph
Have left quotation marks ‘as is’

6. Delete ‘is’ at end of 2nd line page 12 3rd paragraph
Done

7. Consider changing self-other on page 13 2nd paragraph
Done

8. Consider changing ‘the’ recalled to ‘they’ recalled on page 14
Done

9. Page 18 3rd paragraph – revise number of and’s in sentence
Done

10. Page 20 2nd paragraph consider moving bracketed words to end of sentence
Done

11. Review sentence on page 22 commencing “This is consistent…”
Done

12. Page 30 1st paragraph ‘impacts of peoples’ = ‘impacts on peoples’
Done

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests

Reviewer # 2 (H Oshitani)

MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISION
1. The text is too long and difficult to capture the contents, the authors should consider to create a summary table and move most of extracts as annex.
We have reduced text where appropriate and removed several participant quotations; however as this is a qualitative methodology we believe that qualitative readers will want to see the findings our summaries are based upon. We refer to similar qualitative articles published by BMC Public Health e.g. BMC Public Health 2009, 9:258 doi:10.1186/1471-2458-9-258 and draw comparisons to length and layout for qualitative studies.
2. The focus group discussions were conducted between May and July 2010, which was almost one year after the first wave of pandemic H1N1 2009. Most of analyzed information including risk perception and actions might have been quite different during the first wave. The study collected qualitative information about community responses to key health messages in the New Zealand 2009 and 2010 H1N1 campaigns. We have amended text on page 2 (Abstract-Background) to strengthen this point and already refer to this in the last sentence of Background section on page 5.

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISION

1. More information regarding the background of participants including education, occupation and income level should be provided if available. Table 1 provides an overview of participant characteristics. The funding body did not require data to be specified by education, occupation or income. We did not gather education, occupation or income level data. We collected employment/non-employment data. We have also added a legend for each focus group to Table 1.

2. From the last paragraph of page 28, the authors discussed the limitations of the study. This section should be under separate subheading. Done – now appears as sub-heading ‘Limitations of this study’ on page 30.

3. It is unclear if the focal group discussions were focused on pandemic H1N1 2009 or pandemic influenza or influenza in general. For example, in ‘Risk’ (page 7) it is unclear if they discussed the risk of pandemic in general or specifically pandemic H1N1 2009. Also in ‘Vaccination’ (page 17-18), it seems that most discussions were done for seasonal influenza vaccinations. Pandemic H1N1, pandemic influenza and influenza in general were all discussed by the focus groups in the context of risk perception. Minor adjustments have been made to the sections on page 7 and 8 for context.

In relation to ‘Vaccinations’ participants relayed their general beliefs and vaccination uptake and how the risk of a pandemic had or had not affected their decisions from 2009 on. New second sentence added for clarification.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests