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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors,

Thank you for addressing my previous comments. This study already adequate quality to be published.

However, I still have minor suggestions that could improve the quality of this manuscript.

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.

P2L13: to assess health professionals` acceptance and willingness to pay (WTP)

P2L34: .52)

P3L18: 2 billion people ave evidence of past or present infection? Is it valid statistic?

P4L44: workers` acceptance and WTP .... and their determinants.

P5L16: medical doctor, nurses.. not capital.

P6L6-31: The response variable 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.

P6L46: not capital i.e. medical doctor, etc

P8L39: Just HBV vaccination

Table 2 cannot be called as Factor related with acceptance because authors did not measure the relationship between acceptance ad those factors. This table is a bit confusing because authors put all variables which are not link each others. 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 barchart 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 soon, 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.

Is it common provide marginal effect till 7 digits? - Please check and revise the manuscript if required.

P9L46: P<0.001 if P less than 0.001 not 0.000

Thank you
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