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Author’s response to reviews:

Please find enclosed our revised manuscript. We would like to thank the reviewers for their comments on our first version. We have carefully answered every comment. All changes are highlighted in yellow in the manuscript.

Please address all correspondence to Cécile Aenishaenslin: cecile.aenishaenslin@umontreal.ca

Yours truly,

Cécile Aenishaenslin (on behalf of the authors)

Editorial Requests:
In accordance with BioMed Central editorial policies (http://www.biomedcentral.com/about/editorialpolicies#StandardsofReporting), could you please ensure your manuscript reporting adheres to COREQ guidelines (http://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/coreq/) for reporting qualitative research. This is so your methodology can be fully evaluated and utilised. Can you please include a completed COREQ checklist as an additional file when submitting your revised manuscript.

Answer: We submitted an additional file presenting comments for each criteria of the COREQ checklist.

We specified in the manuscript which author was the interviewer (line 170). We add a sentence to refer to the additional file in the manuscript (lines 180-182): "Details relative to the interviewer and to qualitative data collection, analyse and reporting are presented in the supplementary material, using the consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative studies (COREQ) [45]."

A sentence was also added in the manuscript to address saturation of data (lines 210-211.)

Answers to reviewer #1:

Overall the authors have presented an insightful analysis into public perception of LD and potential interventions. These observations should provide useful context to public health officials considering LD interventions. With this audience in mind, it would be helpful to summarize a few concrete points in the conclusion that should be part of the planning process. For example, if they were to attempt to get public feedback prior to implementation, they should be specific about the scale of any planned interventions and the costs involved, and address other community-level concerns. It would also be worth emphasizing the role of education about the interventions affecting perceptions of those interventions.

Answer: We thank the reviewer for this good suggestion. We add this sentence in the conclusion (lines 366-368): Moreover, the study underlines the importance for decision-makers to be explicit about the public costs, the scale at which the intervention will be implemented, and its known impacts on ecosystems, when presenting an intervention to the target populations, as these aspects can modify its acceptability.
Line 54 should read "LD is the most frequently reported vector-borne disease..."

Answer: Corrected

Line 70: It is worth mentioning that the perceived negative health impacts of the Lyme Disease vaccine are the reason the vaccine was removed from the market, so other interventions have suffered from social acceptibility issues (http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0950268806007096)

Answer: This is true. However, as we are referring to vector control strategies in the paper, we prefer the example of larvicides to illustrate the importance of acceptability.

Table 2: Likely minor translation issues, but the descriptive characteristic "knew LD for more than one year" would probably be better stated was "were aware of LD for more than one year" or "were familiar with LD for more than one year" (also applies to line 161). Additionally "declared that they knew someone who have ever had LD" should be "declared that they knew someone who has ever had LD"

Answer: Corrected.

Answer to reviewer 2:

The article entitled "Acceptability of tick control interventions to prevent Lyme disease in Switzerland and Canada: a mixed-method study" by Cecile Aenishaenslin, Pascal Michel, André Ravel, Lise Gern, François Milord, Jean-Philippe Waaub, and Denise Bélanger is a valuable contribution in understanding the problems regarding acceptance of environmental ticks control. It can be useful for public authorities responsible for public health intervention. The problem of acceptability of tick control interventions is undertaken only by a few researchers. Whereas, tick-borne disease are among the emerging (re-emerging) diseases, and generate high costs (both direct and indirect medical cost, as well as nonmedical cost). The methods used by the authors have some limitations, as explained in the discussion, which does not affect the value of the article

Answer: No changes needed.