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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor-in-Chief,

The manuscript entitled "Health professionals’ willingness to pay for Hepatitis B virus vaccination in Gondar City Administration Governmental Health Institutions, Northwest Ethiopia” was submitted to your journal for publication (Manuscript ID: BHSR-D-19-00616R2). We got essential comments which helped us improve the quality of the manuscript. We would like to thank the reviewers for their excellent work in reviewing our manuscript. We made point-by-point responses for each of the comments given by the reviewers.

The following changes are made based on the reviewers’ comments and our further analysis:

1. We revised Table 2 as per the comments of the reviewer.

2. Overall, we tried our best to incorporate all the comments and suggestions given by the reviewer.

Please see the point by point responses given below.

Sincerely

Mezgebu Yitayal
Corresponding author
Editor Comments

1. BMC Health Services Research operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Response: Dear Editor, thank you very much for your unreserved effort to improve the quality of this manuscript. We checked the online peer review system if there are additional comments. We got the following comments and suggestions and we tried our best to incorporate the comments and suggestions given.

Reviewer Comments (RC): Harapan Harapan

RC1: Usually, this kind of study come with Acceptance and WTP. Acceptance should come first. No need to mention primary and secondary objective. Just say acceptance and WTP.
Response: Corrected

RC2: P2L13: to assess health professionals’ acceptance and willingness to pay (WTP)
Response: Corrected

RC3: P2L34: .52)
Response: Corrected

RC4: P3L18: 2 billion people have evidence of past or present infection? Is it valid statistic?
Response: Thank you for the comment. It is actually valid statistic as we got it from an article published by Lavanchy D. entitled Hepatitis B Virus Epidemiology, Disease Burden, Treatment, and Current and Emerging Prevention and Control Measures. April 2004. Journal of Viral Hepatitis 11(2):97-107. DOI:10.1046/j.1365-2893.2003.00487.x

RC5: P4L44: workers’ acceptance and WTP.... and their determinants.
Response: Corrected

RC6: P5L16: medical doctor, nurses. not capital.
Response: Corrected

RC7: P6L6-31: The response variables in this study were acceptance and WTP for HBV vaccination. Acceptance for HBV vaccination was measured by asking the respondents: "Are you willing to pay for HBV vaccination?" The alternative options were: "Yes" or "No". Then explain WTP definition. Then: The respondents were first asked..... Delete Health professional definition from this part.
Response: Corrected

RC8: P6L46: not capital i.e. medical doctor, etc
Response: Corrected
RC9: P8L39: Just HBV vaccination
Response: Corrected

RC10: Table 2 cannot be called as Factor related with acceptance because authors did not measure the relationship between acceptance and those factors. This table is a bit confusing because authors put all variables which are not link each other. What I can suggest to the authors are:
1. Delete the Table 2 and provide only the information the reasons not-willing to pay (the last part of the Table) either in Table or in the bar chart and use "Reasons of non-willing to pay" as the title not "factors associated" because authors did not analysis them. If authors can see, in the explanation authors only explained this part and ignored about special training, medical advice and seen HBV patient because the association of these factors with acceptance have not analysed yet (P8L52-60).
2. Analysis the factors associated with Acceptance (See Harapan et al. Vaccine 2019;37:1398-1406; Harapan et al. Vaccine. 2016;34(32):3670-3675). In this study authors have to assess whether for example gender, age, religion, workplace, marital status and so on, taken special training, got medical advice, seen patients associated with acceptance or not. I recommend option 2 because this is the standard otherwise option 1 is acceptable too.
Response: Thank you for the critical comments. Initially, we focused on the willingness to pay and we did not give much emphasis for acceptance (willing to pay). However, credit to the reviewer comments, we address some of the issues related to acceptance for HBV vaccination, at least in descriptive way. However, we would better to use option 1 for this manuscript.

RC11: Is it common to provide marginal effect till 7 digits? - Please check and revise the manuscript if required.
Response: Thank you for your question. We could round up the marginal effect of -.1939135 and -.1713363 to -.1939 and -.1713, respectively. However, it is difficult to round up the marginal effect of .000037 to four digits that result in .0000. Therefore, just to keep the uniformity, we opted to report the actual output of the analysis.

RC12: P9L46: P&lt;0.001 if P less than 0.001 not 0.000
Response: Corrected