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Level of interest: A paper whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Advice on publication: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the compulsory revisions

[note from editor: see also an edited version of the manuscript provided by this reviewer, which will be passed on separately]

Comments:

a) Discretionary revisions

1. On page 5, state how many total cases of TBE there were in 2000, rather than in the first 38 weeks, and include 2001 data if available.

2. On page 9 at the bottom, state what variables in the logistic regression analysis from the bivariate analysis did not remain associated with awareness of tetanus vaccination status.

3. Hyphenate well-being

4. On page 12, where do you show that no significant difference was found between the 5 types of vaccination? Refer to a table if shown, or state that this table is not shown.

b) Compulsory revisions

1. In your abstract, the Background section is really not background. It's a statement of your specific aim, so it should be labeled as such. A background section could say something like "Adult vaccination status may be difficult to obtain, often requiring providers to rely on individual patient recall."

2. Your abstract does not accurately reflect the study results when it states that German and French speaking employees were more often aware. In the discussion section, it states that German speaking employees were more aware, but not French.

3. You should not introduce any new information in the discussion section. Number 2 above should have been stated in the results section and then referred to in the discussion section, rather than being stated in the discussion section but not in the results section.
4. On page 2, I don't think you can assume that vaccine safety concerns are “unsubstantiated”. The way you state this makes it seem that you think this of all vaccine safety concerns. You should take out the sentence about multiple sclerosis and hep B vaccine, but include the references about this, along with references about other safety controversies.
5. On page 5, it is not at all clear why you state that the facts indicate that tetanus vaccine effects may last longer than 10 years. Explain.
6. There are several words which are repeatedly misspelled. Show your paper to an American editor to fix these errors.
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