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Reviewer's report:

Control of influenza remains a major concern not only for policy-makers and public health professionals but for people across the globe especially after 2009-10 pandemic. Risk communication to public during the pandemic is an important step in which media often plays an important role. However, it is essential to understand in what way the press deals with pandemic. In this context, the present manuscript provides an example. It describes the content analysis of press coverage during pandemic influenza H1N1 in Germany 2009/10. It provides important insights for media to take appropriate measures in case such situations arise in future.

The article can be considered for publication; however, there are a few points that need to be addressed.

Major compulsory Revisions

1. Abstract: The last sentence does not provide an appropriate reasoning. Authors should reword it.
2. Some details or may be a footnote on 'Risk communication' may be helpful for readers. Authors may refer to the WHO website
3. Lines 52-53: Reasoning is not appropriate. Authors may reword this.
4. Lines 55-58: If possible, providing proportion of deaths across all age groups would be useful to understand differences more clearly.
5. Lines 61-62: Why many cases remain unreported in a developed country like Germany? It would be useful to understand reasons behind no reporting.
6. Lines: 85-87: No reference was provided for this study.
7. The background section is lengthy. Authors need to condense that. I feel some sentences may go as a part of discussion section. In the present version, it takes a long time for the readers to get to the aim and objectives.
8. Although a detailed background is provided, the aim and objectives need to be clearly stated.
9. Chi-square test was mentioned in the methods, but there was no mention in the paper.

Minor comments
1. In a few places authors used present tense where use of past tense may be
more appropriate.

2. Table 1: Caption for Number and % may be useful.

3. Figure 2: In addition to weeks, inclusion of years may be useful to understand the timeframe.

4. Authors need to pay attention to the tense used in some sentences. Since this report is based on the event occurred during 2009-10, use of past tense would be more appropriate.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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