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Reviewer's report:

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.

Line 54 should read "LD is the most frequently reported vector-borne disease..."

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 acceptability issues (http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0950268806007096)

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"

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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Needs some language corrections before being published
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