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Reviewer's report:

General comment
This manuscript describes parental views of HPV vaccination of sons in France, Germany, Italy, and the UK. The strengths of this study include the relatively large sample size as well as the inclusion of respondents from four different countries. Overall, the paper is well-written, though could benefit from clarification, especially in the methods section. Specific comments are described below.

Major compulsory revisions
1. Abstract, methods section: as written it is a bit unclear. The literature review was conducted in order to develop a survey – though in fact this is not a literature review study, but rather a cross-sectional survey of respondents from four EU countries. Please clarify.
2. Introduction section, third paragraph, second sentence: this sentence needs referencing/citation(s).
3. Methods section: more details on the sampling strategy would be helpful.
   a. it would be useful (especially for non-expert reader) to provide more specifics on quota sampling, specifically highlighting the fact that this is a non-random sample;
   b. it would also be useful to better describe the specifics of your sampling strategy; how were phone numbers selected; how were respondents from in-person interviews selected; were these street-intercept, did you knock on doors, etc.
   c. how many respondents in total were targeted? How many were deemed ineligible? what was the refusal/acceptance rate?
4. Methods section: were there any consent procedures for participation? Were respondents remunerated for their participation? Was their ethics committee approval?
5. Methods section: was the original questionnaire developed in English? how were translated materials verified for accuracy?
6. Methods section: Please describe “brief oral information was given to respondents…” In the introduction you mention that oral information about HPV transmission is given, though it is unclear that you mean the same here.
7. Methods section: I’m not quite sure what you mean by “systematic analysis breakdown”, especially since I don’t see results for these analysis presented in the manuscript

8. Results section: It would be useful to provide a table describing respondent characteristics in more detail including gender of respondent, region, number/gender of children, education, etc. This information will not only be useful in getting a better sense of your sample, but given that much of the results are presented as a comparison of countries in would be important to know how and in what ways the samples from each country may have been different. Some of the differences in HPV vaccination attitudes by country may in fact be explained and/or confounded by differences in your sample.

9. Results section, second paragraph: “Exceptions were that, in Germany, region of residence was a significant variables, whereas town size was related to acceptability…” Please be more specifics as to what regions/what town size.

10. Results section, section starting with “Italy.” Parents in mid-sized cities were less favourable to vaccination, though it is unclear what the reference category is (all in non-midsized cities?)

11. Discussion section – I would suggest reorganizing the contents of the discussion a bit. It may be useful to start with a recap of the major findings of your survey and the implications of these findings. Perhaps move paragraphs 3-6 up, and move the limitations paragraph so that it follows the main findings and the relevance of these findings.

Minor essential revisions

1. Results section, section starting with “Italy”, last sentence should be corrected to read that “their daughters” had been vaccinated instead of “these”

2. Results section, paragraph starting with “A broader range of answers were given…” the last sentence starting with “and in Italy, 59% said their son was also being at risk of HPV infection” reads awkwardly. Please consider revising.

3. Results section, past paragraph by the term “listened” presumably you mean parents were influenced or valued messages by the different providers/health authorities. Would be useful to clarify what you mean here.
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