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Miss Colette Homan
The BioMed Central Editorial Team

Dear Miss Homan,

Re: Manuscript MS: 5492843333196673
“Will the community nurse continue to function during H1N1 influenza pandemic:: a cross-sectional study of workplace survey in Hong Kong”

We are very grateful for your acceptance letter on 31 Mar 2010 concerning this manuscript, and we have further revise it in accordance with the comments of the reviewers and editorial team.

Thank you very much again for providing the opportunity to publish the mentioned manuscript in the *BMC Health Service Research*.

Yours sincerely,

Eliza LY Wong (on behalf of the authors)
Assistant Professor
School of Public Health & Primary Care
Faculty of Medicine
The Chinese University of Hong Kong
Response to the comments of the reviewers and editorial team in relation to the manuscript:

**Manuscript MS: 5492843333196673**

“Will the community nurse continue to function during H1N1 influenza pandemic: a cross-sectional study of workplace survey in Hong Kong”

Comments are written in italics and responses in normal text. Sections taken from the manuscript are marked by parentheses.

**Editorial Team**

1. We need to you confirm that your study received ethical approval, or whether this was not required, and include a statement to this effect in your methods section, including the name of the committee that granted approval if appropriate.

**Response:**

I have included the statement in relation to the ethical approval as follows (P. 8, line 2-3):

“The study was reviewed and approved by the Survey & Behavioural Research Ethics Committee of The Chinese University of Hong Kong.”

**Reviewer: Wayne Triner**

1. P.1, line 2&3; should read “a cross-sectional study of Hong Kong community nurses” or “a workplace survey of Hong Kong community nurses”

**Response:**

The topic is revised as your suggestion: Will the community nurse continue to function during H1N1 influenza pandemic: a cross-sectional study of Hong Kong community nurses? (P.1, line 2&3)

2. P.3, line 2; P.10, line 16; CIs are adequate, p=…is redundant.

**Response:**

The p=…are deleted as suggestion.

3. P.11, line 1-15; This would be better expressed as a few global sentences and referral of the reader to the table.

**Response:**

I have deleted the detail results and expressed as a few global sentences as follows:

“Participants who were unwilling or unsure about taking care of patient who was all regarded as “suspected H1N1 cases” generally reported a significantly higher level of psychological stress in various areas including the contraction risk of own and family to H1N1 due to the job, quality of life, activity of living, psychological status and emotional status, in which the details are listed in Table 3. Those who were unwilling or unsure were also significantly more dissatisfied with the influenza case arrangement of the Hospital Authority (unwilling mean score 69.3mm, willing mean score 74.4mm, p<0.049) (Table 3).”