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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

Wada et al. conducted a web-based survey of vaccination attitudes in Japan to investigate association between mistrust for governmental vaccine recommendation and the socioeconomic characteristics of working-age individuals. Approximately 30% of study participants reported mistrust towards governmental recommendation for vaccination. In the population, they considered other resources of vaccine information and some factors were associated with their health status. Overall, it is interesting topic to investigate; however, there are some major limitations, especially in selecting study participants and statistical analyses.

1. Page 8, Line 120-127, Table 1. One of the major limitations of this study is that selection bias of the study participants. They were registered in an online survey, and they were selected from 7,087 individuals who were initially contacted. In addition, it is odd to this reviewer to have almost equal numbers of study participants in each age range. What was the selection process?

Page 10, Line 154-157. The definitions of their health and smoking status are vague and subjective. The authors need to define more detailed definitions to understand better about their health and smoking status.

Page 10, Line 162 – 165; Table 3. Multivariate analyses should include the factors which are statistically significant in univariate analyses or are known to be important in the previous studies. In this study, all factors are included in the multivariate analyses, which need to be reanalyzed.

Page 18, Line 311 - Page 19, Line 318. The discussion of smoking individuals is poor. What are more effective interventions? Authors should discuss further what the strategies are to provide appropriate information in the high-risk population.

Table 2. Authors should describe the data in all study participants. What is the reason to analyze the data dividing between male and female? What was the hypothesis? The results of statistical analyses between trust and mistrust groups need to be summarized in the Table.

Minor Essential Revisions

Page 6, Line 82. “Human Papilloma Virus“ should read “Human papilloma virus”.
Discretionary Revisions

1. Introduction is too long and wordy. Authors need to summarize why this study was conducted. Nothing was described why they analysed the data divided in gender.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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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