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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript reports on a survey carried out on 3140 Japanese people concerning their attitude toward vaccination and, in particular, their trust toward the government recommendations.

The aim of the study is well defined and the methods are appropriate. The manuscript is well written and limitations of the work are clearly stated.

However, I think that the results section might be greatly improved and better structured, and statistically significant results clearly indicated.

In detail, the minor essential revisions that I suggest are:

1) Line 52 in the abstract: p-value for trend is reported, and also mentioned in the methods section (line 173), but it is not reported in the results section.

2) In the results section (lines 191-195), the authors report the general demographic characteristics as also reported in table 1. However, although the authors states that their main interest was the trust on the government, it would be interesting to know if, for instance, the source of trusted information was different depending on age, gender, general health status, or educational level. If not, it should be reported, while in case of significant differences, those should be stated, possibly together with p-values, and the table should be modified adding separate columns for the appropriate characteristics (as done for males and females in table 2).

3) Also in table 2 significant differences between males and females should be indicated, reporting significant p-values or marking significant differences by an asterisk. In particular, they report a worsening self-rated health conditions for women significantly associated with mistrust for the governmental recommendations in the discussion (lines 302-304), but not in the results. In addition, it seems to me that also the source of information is somewhat different among males and females.

4) Significant p-values should be reported or indicated by asterisks for non statistician readers also for the associations with mistrust attitudes toward the government recommendations (table 3). In particular, the authors report they had adjusted the analysis for education levels (line 172) and that participants who had completed university education or higher had a lower risk of mistrust for governmental recommendations on vaccination at the univariate statistical
analysis (line 332), but this is not reported neither in the results section nor in table 3.

5) Line 298-299: the authors comment that a previous study revealed that family and friends’ recommendation was a positive factor in influenza vaccination, especially among those aged in their 20s. It would be interesting to know if in the present manuscript this can be evaluated and reported it in the results section.

Some discretionary revisions are:

1) Line 131: the sample size was calculated based on a mistrust on the government recommendations of 30%: on what is it based this 30%?

2) Since the questionnaire is not validated (line 345), it should be attached or better described: how many questions and which ones are part of it? Only those listed in the text from line 136 to line 171? In this case, please, clearly state it. I wonder if in the questionnaire it is clear if the topic is “adult” only or also “child” vaccinations, if there are questions about the perceived risk about vaccinations and on the participants decisions about get vaccinated.

3) Since the target sample are adults, I assume that the topic of the manuscript is about “adult” vaccination. Child vaccinations, in my opinion, has quite different implications, attitude and perception of risks. If I am right, in the title and in the text it should be clearly stated that the topic is “adult” vaccination, otherwise a proper discussion should be added.

4) Line 161: please, specify which univariate analysis have been undertaken: logistic regression? Chisquare comparisons?

5) The table’s title should better indicate their aims.
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