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Reviewer’s report:

This is a good paper and findings are important to those with closely related research interest. Given the emergence of new avian viruses in recent years, the paper should be considered for publication. Although most of my comments have been addressed, few sections need further works before publish this paper.

- Major Compulsory Revisions

1. One main issue is age variable. In table 1a, 1b, 3 and results is mentioned that age was a categorical variable. While in table 2 and 4 (which are mina tables), age is used as continuous variable. The OR also shows that age is used as continuous variable and foot notes confirm this.

- Minor Essential Revisions

1. Page 8, para 1 (Both of these surveys recruited LPMWs …….). This is confusing paragraph. First it should go in results. Then authors state, “there was no significant difference between these two groups [Table 1]”, while two groups were different in respect to gender and education.

This is also contrary to what is mentioned in page 9 para 1 (i.e. However, workers in the wet markets had a significantly higher proportion of males [52.6% (226/430)] as compared to the CRs [29.9% (125/418)] (p<0.001). Overall, the CRs had higher levels of education than the LPMWs (p<0.001).

2. Page 9 para 1 and 2 should go in results. Here you are comparing demographics, which is part of results.

3. Page 6, para 2. Authors mentioned 4 specific objectives. I think first two are enough and cover other two as well.

4. Page 7, para 2, it would be good to mention time period in the start of paragraph, (i.e. we conducted a two-stage survey ……… ).

5. Table 5, and page 16, para 3, I assume “oral masks” is surgical mask or cloth masks. Please change accordingly.

6. Table 3 is comparing demographics. Why variable “Acceptance of avian influenza vaccine” is included in this table.

7. Table 6. Add P-values column in the table. To me these are most important findings of the study.
8. Result: page 12, para 2. Authors state, “To compare differences in the risk awareness and attitude between LPAI versus HPAI between LPMWs and CRs, “occupation” was the variable used to evaluate the two groups and all the statistically significant factors are shown in Tables 2 and 4, respectively”. First this should go in method section. Second this statement is correct for mainly tabled 6-8. In other tables “occupations is just used as study variable.

9. Page 16, para 1. “After the government declared the outbreaks of HPAI in Taiwan in 2012, protective behavior and shopping habits changed’ This para need revision. Table 5 does not show before and after data of protection behaviour and just compare difference after HPAI among LPW and CR. So we cannot say it is changed. To say that we have to give previous data.

10. Page 17, para 1. “Ten No’s, Five Needs” policy (Table 6) is not significant, while mentioned otherwise.

- Discretionary Revisions

1. Paper is quite long and introductions and discussions sections can be reduced.
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