

PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below.

ARTICLE DETAILS

Title (Provisional)

Determining the intention of receiving the influenza vaccine: A cross-sectional survey among international and domestic college students in the U.S.

Authors

Liu, Chengching Hiya; CHEN, ANGELA CHIA-CHEN; Ling, Jiying; Liu, Charles; Zahry, Nagwan; Ammigan, Ravichandran; Kaur, Loveleen

VERSION 1 - REVIEW

Reviewer	1
Name	Dopelt, Keren
Affiliation Management	Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Health Policy and
Date	18-Apr-2024
COI	no competing interests

The paper is written in a good and interesting manner. I would suggest to the authors to explain to the international audience about international students' health insurance, and generally whether vaccines are privately acquired for both populations and how accessible they are. Additionally, it is important to address in the discussion the level of trust in the healthcare system among students and its impact on vaccine hesitancy. See, for example: <https://doi.org/10.3390/vaccines11111728>

Reviewer	2
Name	Antonopoulou, Vivi
Affiliation Behavioural Science	Newcastle University, NIHR Policy Research Unit in
Date	02-Aug-2024
COI	None

This is very interesting paper using theory (TPB) to compare US domestic students flu vaccination intention with international students. It is well-structured, clear and easy to read. I have the following recommendations which can enhance the quality of the manuscript:

Abstract

The abstract needs to make it clear that when referring to domestic students, this means University students in the United States – please add this clarification in the abstract.

Introduction

p. 3, lines 57-60

"Due to shared classroom and living spaces 58 and participated in larger social events frequently, the influenza attack rate among college students was high. Moreover, they were not concerned about influenza and presented low, influenza vaccination intention." As the past tense is used which signifies a particular time point in the past, it is not clear what period/point in time this refers to, or was this over a few years, e.g. during the pandemic, when? Please specify. If you refer to the current status of students at universities, then use present tense.

p. 4, lines 88-89: "Ajzen concludes that the most powerful determinant of an individual's behavior is the intention to engage in that behavior; and the intention to enact a certain behavior is determined and influenced by attitudes, subjective norms, and PBC." Ajzen is the main theorist of TPB but this name has not been mentioned previously in the manuscript so I would suggest avoid using a name when it has not been introduced. Name the theory/its components instead.

p.4, line 92-93 "Researchers have applied the TPB to analyze individuals' intention and attitudes towards vaccination (eg, influenza, COVID-19, and HPV vaccines); however, findings are inconsistent" – the findings are not inconsistent, they may be inconclusive, mixed or variable depending on the context and a number of other factors that may have been measured across different research studies and for different vaccines. Rephrase.

p.5, lines 106-107: "The findings could help to inform evidence-based health promotion efforts to 107 increase annual seasonal influenza vaccination rates among this at-risk population."

Why are college students called at-risk population here? This population is not at risk or vulnerable by any criteria or definitions across the world. Can you please elaborate on this point? A different reason should perhaps be cited as the rationale for investigating flu vaccine uptake for this population group?

p. 6, line 121: "...a sample size of 119 in each group was needed to achieve..." can you provide some additional information on how the power calculations for each group were done? Did you base this on previous literature for each group separately?

p.8, lines 173-175: “For vaccination status, participants were asked to indicate how up to date they were on overall vaccinations, with responses including (1) currently up to date, (2) no, but planning to be updated, or (3) no, and not planning to be updated.” This is very vague. Which vaccinations do you mean here? How would (or to what it can be assumed that) international students know which ones are required for the specific context (e.g. US) in relation to all vaccines? Would it not be more useful to specify which vaccines were mandatory for this population in the US? Related to this point is previous flu vaccination which has been consistently found in many studies to be one of the key variables associated with flu vaccine intention. Why was this not measured explicitly?

Results and Discussion

Can you situate the findings within the international literature context? Specifically, can you discuss to what extent the results for flu vaccine intention in this study was higher or lower than other studies/student populations – this would be particularly useful in trying to interpret the results of the international students (your discussion currently only refers to the theoretical constructs, but would be helpful for readers to see comparisons of the mean scores for vaccination intention).

VERSION 1 - AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer 1	Our responses
1. The paper is written in a good and interesting manner. It is important to address in the discussion the level of trust in the healthcare system among students and its impact on vaccine hesitancy.	We addressed the discussion about trust and vaccine hesitancy issued in line 311-322.

Reviewer 2	Our responses
1. P. 3, lines 57-60: It is not clear what period/point in time this refer to, or was this over a few years, e.g. during the pandemic, when? Please specify. If you refer to the current status of students at universities, then use present tense.	We have revised the sentence to use the present tense, indicating ongoing relevance and experiences that began in the past and continue to the present. Please see lines 58-61.
2. P. 4, lines 88-89: I'd suggest avoid using a name (Ajzen) when it has not been introduced. Name the theory/its components instead.	we revised the sentence based on your recommendation. Please see lines 88-90
3. P. 4, lines 92-93: The findings are not inconsistent, they may be	We revised the sentence based on your recommendation. Please see lines 92-94.

inconclusive, mixed or variable depending on the context and a number of other factors that may have been measured across different research studies and for different vaccines. Please rephrase.	
4. P. 5, line 106-107: Why are college students called at -risk population here? This population is not at risk or vulnerable by any criteria or definitions across the world. Can you elaborate on this point? A different reason should perhaps be citing as the rationale for investigate flu vaccine uptake for this population group.	We agreed with your point and revised the sentence based on your recommendation. Please see lines108-111.
5. P. 6, lines 121: a sample size of 119 in each group was needed to achieve. Can you provide some additional information on how the power calculations for each group were done? Did you base this on previous literature for each group separately?	We modified the power analysis to ensure the power analysis was aligned with the data analysis methods used in this study. The assumed small effect size was based on prior literature. Please see lines 125-130.
6. P. 8, lines 173-175: how up to date they were on overall vaccinations. How would international students know which ones are required for the specific context in relation to all vaccines?	This question focuses on overall vaccination status rather than any specific vaccine. It reflects individuals' understanding and perception of their own up-to-date vaccinations (lines 180-181). According to the U.S. Department of State—Bureau of Consular Affairs, international students need to ensure their vaccinations are current in order to enter the United States. Several research studies also utilized this question to help researchers better understand college students' attitude toward and intention of receiving vaccination (e.g. Jadhav et al., 2018; Catalano et al., 2024).
7. Results & Discussion: Specifically, can you discuss to what extent the results for flu vaccine intention in this study was higher or lower the results studies/student populations—this would be particularly useful in trying to interpret the results of the international students. Your discussion currently only refers to the theoretical constructs, but would be helpful for readers to see	We have addressed this suggestion in the Results (lines 218-225) and Discussion (lines 253-270).

comparisons of the mean scores for vaccination intention.	
---	--