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Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review once more this paper about vaccination awareness in Switzerland.

I have read the revised manuscript. Many improvements have been made, in particular for Table 3. The authors have done a satisfactory job to change the reference groups and use categorized scales.

However, I am still convinced that Tables 2 and 3 are not informative (cf my comment 2 in the previous review). As these results are well described in the text for each vaccine, they could probably be omitted. Table 3 could also be simplified, as the authors could present their models containing only significant factors, and drop from the table non significant characteristics, unless the authors have good reasons to keep them (confounding?).

One final comment regarding the methodology and results, in relation to the sentence in the Discussion "However, no significant difference between the five types of vaccination was found". I have calculated the 95% confidence interval for one proportion based on the number given in the text, and it was below 1%. Therefore, I am pretty convinced that the 95% CI for each proportion value do not cross each other and are statistically different. The same applies for the missing proportions. I apologize, because I had not seen this problem before, but I think the paper of the authors would benefit with these changes. They should report the 95% CI for each proportion mentioned in Figure 1.

Finally, one mention per Table and Figure is sufficient in the Results section. For really important point, it might be repeated in the Discussion section.
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