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Dear Editor,

Thank you again for providing us with the opportunity to revise and resubmit our manuscript entitled “A qualitative study of the coverage of influenza vaccination on Dutch news sites and social media websites” (ID: 4251504468390154).

Below, you will find our response to your comments, a response to both reviewers’ comments, as well as a response to the Editorial requests.

We look forward to hearing from you soon.

Kind regards, also on behalf of my co-authors,

Birthe Lehmann
Reviewer’s report

Editor’s comments:
As per the reviewer, suggest having a second coder look at the data. If that is not possible, please add text stating that the lack of a second coder is a limitation in the Discussion.

It was not possible for us to have a second coder to look at the data. The amount of work is simply enormous, and we do not expect that including a second coder would significantly change the outcomes of the analyses. We added the limitation of not having invited a second coder in the Discussion section (see p. 30).

Reviewer: Jennifer Pereira

Reviewer’s report:
I am satisfied that the authors have adequately addressed my concerns about the manuscript and recommend it for publication.

Thank you.

Reviewer: Tanya Berry

Reviewer’s report:
Minor essential revisions.

The authors have addressed the majority of my concerns. However, the lack of a second coder is a limitation that needs to be addressed. If the authors decide not to have a second coder look at the data, at the very least they should discuss the limitations of having just one coder (e.g., the greater likelihood of bias).

We discuss the limitation of having just one coder in the Discussion (see p. 30).

Editorial Requests:

1. Competing interests:
Manuscripts should include a “Competing interests” section. This should be placed after the Conclusions/Abbreviations. Please consider the following questions and include a declaration of competing interests in your manuscript:
Financial competing interests
- In the past five years have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of
this manuscript, either now or in the future? Is such an organization financing this
manuscript (including the article-processing charge)? If so, please specify.
- Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organization that may in any way gain or lose
financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future? If so,
please specify.
- Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the
manuscript? Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an
organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the
manuscript? If so, please specify.
- Do you have any other financial competing interests? If so, please specify.

Non-financial competing interests
- Are there any non-financial competing interests (political, personal, religious,
ideological, academic, intellectual, commercial or any other) to declare in relation to
this manuscript? If so, please specify.

We added a Competing Interests section. (see p. 31)

2. Authors' information: Please place the Authors' Contributions section after Competing
interests. Please check the instructions for authors on the journal website for the correct
format to use for Authors' Contributions.

We added an Author's Contribution section. (see p.32)