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Reviewer's report:

Congratulation again to authors for revised version of the manuscript on A Survey of the Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices (KAP) on Zika Virus in New York City!

Some issues raised by reviewers are well addressed by authors. However, here bellow are some further suggestions and recommendations from my side:

CONCERNED ISSUES:

I. Scoring system: I am pretty sure not all questions of WHO KAP questions were included in this survey and therefore I suggest to provide more details the number of question for each domain (KAP and each score K subdomain), scoring for correct or incorrect response and the score range of the of domain.

II. Analysis: I suggest authors to assess the association between K-A-P. For knowledge domain, authors could use total score of K domain rather then split into six domain for this analysis. This is important for KAP study to assess this association to provide data about the translation of the knowledge into practice.

III. Comparing results: I suggest to compare this study finding with other studies either in general population or in the specific population. Some studies in this field are: Gupta N, et al. 2016; Harapan H et al. 2017a; Harapan H et al. 2017b; Painter JE, et al. 2017; Sabogal-Roman JA et al. 2017; Varvara A et al. 2017). This is important for example, the authors wrote: (Line 362-365) "Being that only a minority of participants indicated that they first heard of Zika virus from "healthcare worker/private doctor or pharmacy," suggests that increased educational endeavors led by local healthcare providers are needed..". The authors could elaborate more by analyzing that knowledge of healthcare workers on Zika infection. In fact the knowledge of Zika infection among healthcare workers is low too such as in Indonesia.
OTHER ISSUES

A. Background

1. Line 28-34 -- The sentence is too long and confusing

2. Line 36-37 -- Not related to the next sentences within paragraph

3. Line 36-45 -- The sentences are not flow smoothly, just pieces of information and no coherence.

4. Line 50-51 -- Please revise the sentence

5. Line 52 -- Avoid number to start the sentence

6. Line 52 -- Seems the data is ambiguity or not accurate. Please revise related to "since 2007"

7. Line 56 & 58 -- Please give the full name and abbreviation of New York City (NYC) in the firs time and only abbreviation afterword.

8. Line 65 -- release a survey of Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices (KAP) -- add "kit" e.i survey kit

9. Line 65-66 --"efforts" two times, please revise

10. Line 67-68 -- Need references

11. Line 71 -- Please add study aim of this study

12. Line 71 & 78 -- "Pregnant women" rather than "pregnant person"

13. Line 72-74 -- Only better knowledge> How about attitude and practice?
B. Material & Methods

1. I gusset to move Ethic section to the last part of Materials and Methods

2. Line 86 -- Just put the number of reference

3. Line 92 -- "actual study" rather than "our study"

4. Line 95 -- "pregnant women" rather "pregnant people"

5. Line 97 -- "NYC" not New York City ---Please be consistent

6. Line 100-101 -- Please revise and combine the sentences and do not start sentence with number (again)

7. Line 101-103 -- Please combine these sentences and give the reference in the end.

8. Study Design, Setting and Sites -- Please reduce of using active sentences.


10. Line 125-127 -- I suggest to rearrange the sentence in to K-A-P sequentially and therefore write the sentences afterward.

11. Line 130-132 -- Explain or state the point or score (1 or 2?) clearly. And what about incorrect answer? Write clearly if 0 score was given.

12. Line 135-136 -- Please avoid repetition the domain. I suggest just write "those domains"
13. Line 138 -- Which domain have score 0 to 100? Therefore, I suggest to provide clear scoring system of each domain.

14. I am pretty sure not all questions of WHO KAP questions were included in this survey. Therefore please provide more details the number of question foe each domain and the score range of the of domain.

15. Line 140-141 -- Why not italic. Please be consistent

16. Analysis: I suggest authors to assess the association between K-A-P. For K domain, authors could use total score of K domain rather then split into six domain for this analysis.

17. Please delete "with 95% level of significant"

18. Line 144-145 -- Please move to Results section

C. Results

1. Line 149 -- Again, number

2. Line 150 -- (plus minus SD 11.62)

3. Line 149-160 -- Please do not repeat the data that have stated in the table. Provide the crucial or interesting data only.

4. Line 170 -- information (Table 2) not information. (Table 2). Apply for all.

5. Line 176 -- delete "in the domain of Knowledge of Zika Transmission".

6. Please rewrite all 95%CI in this manuscript into standard format such as 38 (95%: 33-43) (Like 187). The way used in this manuscript could confuses the readers as similar to reference number.
D. Discussion

1. Line 262 -- help in developing

2. Line 262 -- Please revise "helped elucidate"

3. Line 270 -- Please revise "there exists"

4. Line 307 -- were all non-pregnant for male or combine male and female?

5. Line 311 -- Pregnant women
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