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Reviewer's report:

The topic of this article is the situation of the perceptions of workforce after the separating of CDC and Health Inspection Institution. Specific readers such as the PHE managers and the policy makers should be interested in this topic. Overall, the data and the results of the article is fine, however, the academic writing skill especially the language is poor. The background is too long and has not achieved the academic publication level. Major Compulsory Revisions are needed to the following issues

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   No. Some important information was missing or has not been highlighted in the article.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes.

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes.

4. Do the figures appear to be genuine, i.e. without evidence of manipulation?
   Yes.

5. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   No, the manuscript needs to be improved especially for the academic writing.

6. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Yes, but the discussion needs to be improved.

7. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   This part is missing in this article.

8. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
   Yes
9. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
No. The abstract has not conveyed all the required information.
In the background, essential information is missing, such as the importance of HII workers’ knowledge of their duties concerning PHE response, and what kind of the PHE duties should taken by the HII workforce? What is the aim of the study?
In the method, the detailed statistics methodologies were missing.
In the results, there are many grammar mistakes. “A quarter of all the respondents had the lowest knowledge of PHE responsibilities”. There is no explanation regarding the definition or what does it mean of “the lowest knowledge of PHE responsibilities”.
In the discussion and conclusion, the logic and linkage of each sentence are quite weak……
Overall, the abstract needs to be rewrite to include essential information and to be more logic.

10. Is the writing acceptable?
The language is the weakest part of this article. It seems that the article was translated from Chinese and the writing style is kind of like a thesis rather than an academic article. The written English has not achieved the academic standard. There are too many grammar mistakes. The linkage between sentences is weak and the logic is not clear especially in the background. Thus, it is difficult to be followed and understood by general readers. I suggest the article be modified by a native coauthor. In addition, the background needs to be more concise and logic.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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