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Reviewer’s report:

The authors are presenting very informative study results in the particular situation of great earthquake and nuclear accident in Fukushima, Japan. Some revisions would improve the manuscript.

Major compulsory revisions

1. Please identify study hypothesis of present research. Please describe what the authors aimed to clarify through this data collection. Please provide the rationale under which the authors have chosen this study method.

2. Please highlight the originality of present study. Please outline the novelty and strongness of present study compared to overseas studies with similar situation.

3. L138 (Methods/Data collection)
   Please provide the rationale for data sampling. Why the authors selected the period of 3 years before and after the great earthquake? Why in April and May. Were the first 50 attendants those in April? Please provide the possible sampling bias.

4. Please compare present study method which the authors have chosen with other qualitative studies, and also please show the validity of the methods of present study.

5. Discussion is really informative drawing various overseas experiences. What are described in Discussion is generally agreeable, but could be more focused on what was clarified in Results.

6. L344 (Conclusion) If the authors are providing these strategies in conclusion, please focus these three points in Discussion if authors provide subtitles in discussion the manuscript would be more readable.

Minor essential revisions

Authors are describing as ‘parents’ or ‘mothers’ within the text. Please be consistent in expression.

Methods/Data collection
L141-142 This part could be described in Discussion, where the authors could argue whether the findings are consistent or not between these studies.

Results
L229 ‘autonomous action’ Please describe in Discussion how the residents are supported for autonomous decisions through the given information.

Discussion
L313 ‘organizational upgrading’ Please explain from which results this is drawn from.
L335 ‘upgrade their community health activity’ Please explain how the information could make them so?
L337 ‘routine activity report’ Expression is inconsistent could it be ‘parents consultation report’?
L338 ‘clear trends’ Please explain more readably. Is it before and after the great earthquake? How was the change?

Conclusion
L342 ‘City data’ Does it mean parent consultation report?
L342 Please provide examples of ‘deeper understanding’.

References
L397 Reference11: If the paper is already accepted for publication in the journal, please provide doi number.

Discretionary revisions
1. If I were allowed to summarize the study results, I would think study data highlighted the needs of both parents and PHNs. Needs of the parents could be risk communication and mental health support, and public health nurses are highly motivated and they want to improve their own support skills.

2. If the authors consider the importance of risk communication in the community, they had better discuss about the various stakeholders who support risk communication system. Through that, they could easily discuss how the university and PHNs can play roles in risk communication to the resident in disaster area.

3. How the study results could further be useful? Could it be the contents of some manual or could any kind of support tool be created from the results?

4. The manuscript could be more readable if revised by an experienced medical editor whose first language is English and who specializes in the editing of papers written by physicians and scientists whose native language is not English.
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