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The Process by which Perceived Autonomy Support Predicts Motivation, Intention, and Behavior for Seasonal Influenza Prevention in Hong Kong Older Adults

RESPONSES TO REVIEW COMMENTS

Dear Editor and Reviewers:

Thank you so much for all of your valuable comments and suggestions, which have been extremely important and helpful in improving our manuscript. We have studied the comments and suggestions very carefully and made corrections and responses accordingly. All revisions made in the manuscript are marked in red.
RESPONSE TO REVIEWER 1’S COMMENTS

The manuscript describes a study performed to evaluate a framework that integrates self-determination theory and the theory of planned behavior to explain the use of facemask for the prevention of seasonal influenza among Hong Kong older adults. The paper needs editing by a native English person.

RESPONSE: Thank you very much for your kind words about our paper. We appreciate you taking time to comment on our manuscript. We have had the manuscript copy-edited by an English native speaker.

Methods

a) The timeframe considered for the survey should be specified.

RESPONSE: Thank you so much for this suggestion. We have specified the timeframe in which the survey was conducted. Please see page 6 lines 137-138.

b) The participants have been recruited from one senior center in Hong Kong but it is not described how the center has been selected. Did they have a list of all center?

RESPONSE: Thank you for this comment. Data were collected from a convenient sample from a readily accessible center rather than from centers that were collected by random selection. Please see page 5 lines 127-128.

c) The Authors stated that the senior center staff and members of the research team invited 180 older adults to participate, but it is not indicated how the selection has been performed.

RESPONSE: Thank you for this comment. We have rephrased this sentence to make it clear that 180 older adults expressed an interest in participating in the study to senior center staff and members of the research team but only 141 agreed to participate and signed written consent forms and participated in the study. Please see page 6 lines 129-131.
d) It is not indicated how the sample size has been calculated.

RESPONSE: Thank you for this comment. Actually, we did not conduct an a priori power analysis to estimate the sample size beforehand. We have acknowledged this as a limitation in the discussion section. Please see page 15 lines 374-375.

e) It is not clear how the informed consent has been obtained from each participant. Please, clarify

RESPONSE: Thank you so much for this comment. Written informed consent was obtained for each participant. Please see page 6 line 131.

f) Authors describe the questionnaire items used to assess participants past facemask-wearing habit, knowledge of facemask wearing benefits, frequency of influenza infection during the past 6 months, and perceived susceptibility. What about their validity and reliability?

RESPONSE: These measures were used to describe the sample instead of including them into the structural equation model, so we did not provide any validity and reliability statistics. Each of the aforementioned variables includes one item for each variable, precluding computation of validity and reliability statistics. In the revised manuscript, we have specifically mentioned that these three variables were measured using a single item. Please see page 8 lines 190-192.

g) The response rate end the description of the demographic characteristics of the participants presented in Table 1 should be moved in the results section.

RESPONSE: Thank you for this suggestion. We have removed the information on facemask wearing habit, knowledge of the benefits of facemask wearing, and frequency of catching influenza in the past 6 months from Table 1 to the results section as suggested. Please see page 9 lines 211-220.
Results

a) No information is given about non-responding older adults. How did they differ from those in the sample, how representative is the sample and where the findings representative of the geographic area?

RESPONSE: Thanks for this comment. Given that we did not collect information from the non-responding older adults, we do not know differences between responding and non-responding older adults. We also did not collect participants’ address and region of abode. Participants were from different regions of Hong Kong and were regular members of the elderly center.

Discussion

a) A limit of the study is the relatively small number of subjects involved. The Authors should stress this limitation in the Strengths and Limitations section.

RESPONSE: Thank you so much for this comment. Actually we have addressed the issue of the relatively small number of participants. Please see page 15 lines 374-377.

Tables

Table 1. The % reported in each row should be deleted.

RESPONSE: Thank you so much for this suggestion. Given that we have followed the reviewer’s previous suggestion and moved the information from Table 1 to the beginning section of results section. The percentage reported in each row has also be deleted. Please see page 9 lines 213-222.