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Reviewer's report:

The authors present results from a survey about knowledge, attitudes and perceptions of Zika Virus infection among a conveniently sampled group of men and women in New York. This is a timely application of the WHO KAP Survey that demonstrates its potential usefulness in assessing community knowledge and potential avenues for improving general knowledge within communities. Overall, the article is very well written and easy to follow. I have a few MINOR comments that are intended to improve the manuscript.

1. The Results section feels a bit too dense for a simple descriptive analysis. The authors may consider discussing the findings in terms of percentages and then having the actual proportions in parenthesis - like this 20% (40/200) responded that...

2. Related to comment #1, too many sentences start with numbers. For example, line 125 of page 8 (second paragraph of knowledge results), the authors state, "180 (88.2%) of 204 participants..." I was always trained that you can't start a sentence with a number (unless you write it out like this One hundred and eighty...). This occurs frequently throughout the result and should be addressed. Again, following the format I suggested in comment #1 many alleviate this.

3. In the demographics results section (lines 112), the authors state "living in Northern Manhattan (above 125th street)." Just to be clear for an international audience, it may be more precise to state "north of 125th street."

4. I think one of the most noteworthy findings in this study (and one that I was hoping would be addressed the moment the authors mentioned that they purposely sampled pregnant women) is that the behaviors and attitudes surrounding sexual and reproductive health do not align. I think this should be the first thing mentioned in the discussion section - or in the abstract to allure people to read the manuscript. This is an important contribution in my eyes.
5. Although the sample size is small for pregnant women (n=51) it may be worth adding a second table where you show the knowledge and behaviors in the same table to drive home the point discussed in comment #4.

6. Table 1 is clunky and not very reader friendly. I suggest having separate columns for males and females and then reporting the results. Alternatively, you could split up the table by English and Spanish speakers to show potential differences between these groups. Should you do this, it would be appropriate to test for differences with chi-square/t tests (as appropriate) to elucidate other notable findings. Just because you have an overall small sample size doesn't mean you can't at least try to look at some of the differences by gender, language, or another factor. I think one of these approaches will also shed some light on community knowledge and potential disparities.
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