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Reviewer’s report:

In general, there have been many studies surveying this particular topic from all over the world. In my opinion, the subject has already been widely explored, and this survey does not add new input to this field.

The paper would benefit from editing by a native English speaker, who could adjust the grammar and syntax satisfactorily.

Regarding the content of the paper, it does not fulfil the basic criteria which allow it to be published in a medical journal.

Major compulsory revisions:

The title is not precisely covering the content of the study.

Abstract
The author should describe the results precisely.

Introduction
The Introduction is too short. The authors discuss various issues in only seven lines giving 2 references published in 2002 and 1999. So adding few paragraphs as well as adding at least a number of other, up to date references to support their theses would be of great value.

Methods
The terminology and the methods used should be clarified, e.g.

1. Which study design does this survey represent? I would not say it is a “retrospective cohort study”.

2. The question remains as to why that very hospital was selected for the study. One out of how many? Was it more convenient to obtain such a non-random sample? Was that very hospital more co-operative than the others, more available or more willing to be studied? The authors do not explain how many different hospitals/which types are there in the region in which the study was conducted? How many HCWs live in the country/region? How many of them work at hospitals? In other words, to which extend the study population is representative of the region, of the country? There might be a large
generalizability problem. Since the study was conducted among HCWs from 1 university hospitals, the results may not be generalizable to all HCWs in the region/in China. This should be also put into the “Limitations” section which does not appear in the paper.

3. What was the number of HCWs at the hospital at the time of the study? The numbers might vary in 20 year period? So how nominators and denominators were calculated year by year? Through those 20 years were the data collected on the same basis, with the use of the same system?

What does “753 of them had no precise material on vaccination” mean?

4. Part of the Results section is put to the Methods.

Results

The Results section is too short. The authors discuss various issues in only half of the page. Some Results are located by the authors in the Discussion section. What was the reason to compare “status of antibody produced by natural infection versus vaccination”?

Discussion

Some comments should be placed in the Results section.

The discussion section is too brief. Eleven out of 19 references were published ten and more years ago and are insufficient to support the theses described in this paper. Only one of those was published in the last five years.

What are general practical recommendations? A “recommendations” section in the final part of the manuscript would be of value.
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