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Reviewer's report:

Authors have addressed my previous concerns adequately. However, I still have minor concerns.

A. LANGUAGE

This manuscript need to be re-proofread since some typos and grammar issues can be found such as:

Abstract:
-L25: willing to pay not WTP
-L39: "pay" is missing
-L45: Delete Table
-L49: Type of workplace rather place of work
-L51-53: Is it supported by finding? Authors seem talking Acceptance instead of WTP here. Please use WTP and willing to pay correctly in the entry manuscript.

Introduction:
L39: Is it title of article? Serological and Molecular Characterization of Hepatitis B, C and D Viruses Infections among Health Professionals in Ras Desta and Tikur Anbessa Hospitals, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Please delete if yes and replace with "A study"
P4L4: HCWs
P4L34: Please write the organisms correctly.
P5L18: please write name of professional HCWs correctly.
P5L26: Health institution? Simple use health centre and hospital. Because Provincial Health Office could also classified as health institution.

Page5: "All health professionals working in the health institutions during the study period were included in the study". In fact authors sampled the participants from the population. Please revise.
P5L52-60: please revise. What does mean 1st, 2nd here?
P6L6: use was. Avoid is, was&amp;was in one sentence. Please provide the correct definition of WTP here. WTP definition IS NOT willingness of HCWs to pay HBV vaccination. It is simply the full form of WTP.
P6L14: Revise, avoid is, is, was &amp; was in one sentence.

P6: Revise "Physician, Health officer, Nurse, Midwife, Laboratory technician, Pharmacy, Anesthesia, Optometry, and Other (specify)".

I found many sentences that need to be revised in this manuscript. I recommend authors to re-proofread the manuscript.
B. ANALYSIS

I recommend this manuscript to be rechecked by a statistician.

C. CONCEPTS

This my major concern that hasn't addressed adequately. Authors used term of WTP to refer two concepts (one is the true WTP and the second is not WTP). Authors used WTP just by simply as "Do you want to pay for HBV vaccination". This is not WTP. Therefore in point A, I recommend authors to give clear definition of true WTP. The true WTP results are given in Table 3. Table 2 is not WTP. It is more as Acceptance to me. In my perspective, there are two response variables in this study: One true WTP (Table 3) and another is "Acceptance-like variable" (Table 2). By mixing these variables together and called as WTP, makes some parts of this study are confusing in particular when authors using WTP term while it is not true WTP. In short, I recommend authors give clear definition for Response Variables in this study and use different term for the question: "Do you want to pay for HBV vaccination?"
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