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Reviewer's report:

The paper described the potential changes in KAP for live poultry market workers and the general population towards low pathogenic and high pathogenic H5N2. This kind of data is limited and has the potential to inform disease control intervention in the live poultry market setting. However, the study collected samples from different regions in Taiwan at the two stages and the analysis needs to control for the regional differences. The manuscript can be improved by providing more details on the analysis.

Major Compulsory Revisions

Abstract

1. “who neglected the policy on banning live-poultry slaughtering”. Do you mean “opposed”?

Methods

2. Page 8, line 13, could the authors provide more detail on the convenience sampling especially for community residents (CR)? For example, where and when these CRs were recruited?

3. Page 10, line 17, could the authors give 1 or 2 examples of these “other workers”?

4. Page 10, line 24, please elaborate here (or in the appendices) how exactly the ordinal variables were converted to binary. For example, for responses (0) No (1) Somewhat (2) Clearly in Question 10 in Appendix 1, how did you categorize the outcome “somewhat”? This also applies to other variables such as education level.

5. Page 11, line 13, could the authors report some of the relevant statistics (1)-(3), especially for goodness of fit or R2 for the final models?

6. Page 12, line 3, did the authors have any target age range for the CR recruitment?

Results

7. Please report the response rate for the LPM workers and CRs.

8. Table 2 and 6. Could the authors clarify whether it’s a univariate or multivariable analysis? Does it include LPMWs and CRs or the data was pooled
together? Was that only significant factors were shown in the table (but note item 3, oppose ban on live poultry slaughter has a 95% CI covering 1). For the variable age, a reference age group is not needed if it was analyzed as a continuous variable.

9. Table 2 and 6. Would it be possible to have similar outcomes so that results from stage I and II can be more easily compared?

10. Table 4: please clarify the percentages in the first row (87.7% and 78.3%). Are these knowledge scores? And if so, how were it calculated?

11. Table 7, from Figure 1, the stage I survey was carried out in different cities over Taiwan. However, stage II survey was carried out only in Central Taiwan. It seems that there were significant difference across regions of Taiwan (Table 2), would it be possible to control for this factor so that it reflect the change over time rather change in sampling site? Or alternatively the changes can be assessed by restricting to Central Taiwan?

Minor Essential Revisions
12. Table 2 & 6. Please change “mean” to “estimate”
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