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Reviewer's report:

Overall, this study is meaningful and the findings will inform health education and practice although the authors did not discuss adequately in the discussion and conclusion sections. There are no major essential revisions required in this study. The minor essential revisions and discretionary revision are recommended below for authors' consideration.

A. minor essential revisions

1. Study method:
   Face-to-face interviewed: What is the purpose of the face-to-face interview? The fieldworkers read out each item in the questionnaire to let the subjects respond? What did fieldworkers do in the interviews?

2. Measures: The authors had written well which variables they had investigated but have not reported which instruments/tools to be used to measure these variables, e.g the HBM variables-perceived susceptibility, perceived severity, benefits, side effects etc. What are the names and the sources of these instruments? In addition, the psychometric properties of the instruments not yet reported.

3. Statistical analysis:
   As stated in the manuscript, "Factors significantly associated with IV behaviors in the univariate analysis was used as candidates......" Significant association in the univariate analysis, how to observe this in the manuscript and tables? Is it statistical significance?
   Is it significant association with IV behavior in the “ Bi-variate analysis”, instead of univariate analysis? But there is no report of bi-variate analysis in the manuscript and the tables. It is unclear "why" and "which" variables to be put in the regression anlysis. The explanation and justification of this aspect is required. The study framework may help to answer this but the study framework in this study not yet reported clearly.

4. Discussion:
   4.1 Doctor’s recommendations:
Barriers for practices, costs, vaccine safety issues and inability to identify eligible children are the barriers to routine IV taking as cited in the international literatures. But, how about "recommendations" by the doctors of taking routine IV of infants and toddlers? As a minority of parents in this study received Doctors’ recommendations, it would be more practical and relevant to discuss possible methods of recommendations of IV to infants and toddlers by doctors. As reported in this study, more than half of subjects (57%) visited private clinics for the last influenza. This may be one of the opportunities to provide recommendations by doctors for IV. As doctors’ recommendations and parental belief are the significant factors associated with IV uptake so more discussions on relevance of these two factors to clinical practice and education (e.g. possible strategies) are required.

4.2 another finding- 90% of the subjects are more likely to be vaccinated if supported by family in univariate analysis. Although this variable not put in the regression analysis, it is a significant one to indicate the importance of family support in IV uptake. I would suggest to discuss this in the discussion section. Also, another variable, which is "provided proximal to residence"-64%- this is also the significant variable to discuss. The study data will inform strategies/education to improve IV uptake rate so "the significant reasons for and not for" the uptake IV are important to be discussed.

5. Are there any recommendations for the future studies?

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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